In the canyons of the Great Divide
Familiar places we can run and hide
Are filled with strangers
Walking in our houses...alone
In the Great Divide
Nothing to decide
No one else to care for or love
In the Great Divide
You won't fit in too well...
I don't fit in too well.

Neil Young, The Great Divide

University of Alberta

Moving Skilfully Into the Landscape: Implications of (Anti)modernism and the Dwelling Perspective for Outdoor Recreation and Education.

by

Philip Meredith Mullins

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

in

Recreation and Leisure Studies

Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2005

0-494-09055-3

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN:
Our file *Notre reference*
ISBN:

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

The author critiques a form of environmentalism in the literature of outdoor recreation and education influenced by deep ecology and/or the land ethic. Antimodernism and the nature-culture dichotomy expressed in wilderness, it is argued, limit teaching social and environmental responsibility, specifically with regards to place attachment. Connections between symbols of dominant Canadian identity, outdoor recreation, and the landscape are examined. Taking a phenomenological hermeneutic position, Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective is explored as an alternative, ecological approach to environmental thinking. Central themes of landscape, identity, and place are seen as interrelated and mediated through skill. The importance and influence of tools and technology as well as story and myth on the processes of place attachment are discussed. Outdoor recreation and education, it is argued, can be a forum for attentive place building and a method for incorporating and communicating values of certain places within one's identity and to a larger community.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Karen Fox for guiding me through this process. She was trusting and allowed me to wander while discovering my own path, and for that I will be forever thankful. Doctors Andie Palmer and Gordon Walker both inspired and went beyond the call of duty as committee members. Being a student has taken my time away from friends and loved ones too often, yet I continue to rely on their unwavering support. I hope I can match their generosity in the future. Thanks, Ted, for teaching me the true value of rocks, paper, and scissors. All of these relations, and others, have enabled me to learn and weave this trail.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter One: Methodology 14
- Purpose of The Research 14
- Epistemology/Ontology 15
- Research Design: Nomadic Wayfinding 21
- Methods 24
  - Tracking: towards (anti)modernism. 24
  - Evaluating: away from (anti)modernism. 28
  - Moving: towards a heuristic framework. 32
- Conclusion 35

Chapter Two: Literature Review 37
- Definitions and Structures Within ORE 39
- Identity 46
  - Wilderness idol: overly taken with the Canadian type. 54
- Landscape 57
  - Wilderness ideal: reduction of cultural and ecological diversity 61
- Wilderness and Sense of Place 66
  - Wilderness idyll: myths of the canoe and the North. 70
- (Anti)modernism 74
  - Away from (anti)modernism: sense of place literature. 76

Chapter Three: Weaving Landscape, Identity, and Sense of Place Through Skill 84
- Skilled and Technological Knowledge: The use of Tools and Devices 92
  - Skill and tools. 92
  - Technology and devices. 100
- Identity and skill 114
- Landscapes, Places, and Skill 128
  - Sensing a place. 130
  - Building places. 142

Chapter Four: Conclusion 156
- Future Research 171

References 174

Introduction

Outdoor recreation and education (ORE) uses knowledge and skill to build meaningful interpersonal relationships, facilitate personal growth, cultivate sustainable lifestyles, and connect participants to the land (Bailey, 1999; Gillis & Ringer 1999; Hirsch, 1999; Horwood, 1991; Priest & Gass, 1997; Webb, 1999). I come to this project with a concern about the effectiveness of ORE in achieving social and environmental goals, specifically the treatment within ORE of the nature-culture dichotomy.

Working from a hermeneutic approach to phenomenology and following Ingerson's (1994) suggestion for methods of critique, I *tracked* a manifestation of the nature-culture dichotomy within ORE literature. By using Ingold's (2000) methods of reversing the process/form relationship, collapsing dichotomies, searching out a middle ground, and addressing both great divides I examined the treatment landscape-as-wilderness, sense of place, and identity within ORE literature. This tracking necessitated what St. Pierre (1997) calls *nomadic* writing, in which I traversed and connected various topics and formed connections between them by (re)writing, winnowing, and revisiting literature. Thus, my exploration was as a *wayfinder*, not following a pre-determined route but rather examining the track left behind. I came to see that much of the ORE literature I worked through was, to an extent, antimodern. While doing this I was also reconstructing connections between themes and finding entry for the dwelling perspective in order to move away from an antimodernism. Connections were made between themes, needed themes were added, and paradoxes were examined while exploring the interrelated aspects of landscape, identity, and sense of place.

I began the literature review by considering various critiques to the structure and stated goals of ORE. According to some authors (Fox, 2000; Haluza-Delay, 1999; Raffan, 1991), achievement of these goals has been limited to certain cultural groups or classes by the dominant ideas of wilderness and pedagogical practices of the field. These critiques, in my opinion, share a concern for the effects of the division between "nature" and culture that persists within dominant Western ORE.[1] I present various authors' critiques that together indicate needed improvement in the ability of ORE to foster connections between participant and their social or physical environments so as to produce lasting awareness and behaviour changes in accordance with the field's stated values and goals. I then turn my attention to describing a prominent way ORE is constructed and treated within North America, while drawing on specifically Canadian examples when possible. By looking specifically at outdoor adventure education, environmental education, and recreation resource management, I focused on how ORE experiences resonate with and are framed loosely around Leopold's land ethic and the deep ecology movement.

A small group of researchers (Drengson, 2001; Henderson 1990; Henderson 1987, 1994, 1997, 1999; Horwood, 1991; Quinn & Scott, 1997) and practitioners in ORE have attempted to address the nature-culture dichotomy by matching writing from the deep ecology movement and the land ethic with resonate theories and practices in ORE. The research relating to this loose affiliation can be read as a rough *socio-environmental ethical framework* for ORE. The term *socio-environmental ethical framework* (henceforth *SE ethical framework*) refers to an ethical argument or value judgement, explicit and

[1] I use both *nature* and *culture* ironically, because I question not only the way dominant Western and Anglo-Canadian ORE conceptualises these terms set against one another, but also how nature and culture come into existence.

implicit, stemming from concerns about social and environmental responsibility regarding the importance and function of ORE in "society" relative to environmental issues.[2] Such a framework explains how ORE programs and activities might work to achieve goals related to social and environmental change. Because I am interested in exploring an alternative to the nature-culture dichotomy, I will refer to "socio-environmental" responsibility to represent the indivisibility of environmental and social issues.

I examine this SE ethical framework of ORE in an attempt to move past the nature-culture dichotomy and open another approach to achieving greater socio-environmental responsibility through connections to place. The pieces cited from within ORE that contribute to this SE ethical framework come from various journals concerned with outdoor recreation, outdoor education, environmental education, resource management, and leisure studies. The articles are connected in three ways: (a) Authors strive to position and justify ORE ethically in response to environmentalism and environmental degradation, (b) they do so in a way that supposedly "bridges the gap" between humanity and "the environment," (c) they raise questions about and present perspectives on identity, sense of place, and the conception of landscape: topics that are addressed more specifically in other bodies of ORE research.

A review of the concepts of wilderness, sense of place, and identity in research flowing from, resonating with, and reacting to the SE ethical framework is provided. These themes within the literature of ORE are examined as attempts to work towards teaching socio-environmental responsibility. Based on critiques from within ORE

---

[2] I use society ironically, society or community can and does involve more than humans from the perspective of many non-Western cultures. The lines drawn around society and nature—if they exist at all—can be very different from those of the dominant Western or modern perspective.

literature, it appears that aspects of these themes, as currently presented, may be inconsistent with the goal of connecting people to the land. For example, teaching participants to empathize with wilderness as pristine Nature appears to have undermined the efforts to transfer environmental values learnt "out there" to the daily social and political lives of participants (Haluza-Delay, 1999; Shogan, 1988).

As Fox and Lautt (1996) describe, "the values woven into narratives and (auto)biographies of naturalists, explorers, adventurers, Indigenous people (Carson, 1962; Grey Owl, 1975; Lopez, 1986; Muir, 1979) provide the basic sustenance for moral discourse and practice in outdoor education" (p.19). Following this claim, I endeavour to expose some underlying myths that shape the understanding of identity, landscape, and place in Canadian ORE. According to the Canadian Oxford Dictionary (Barber, 2001), a *myth* is "an idealized version of the past, especially as embodying significant cultural realities" (p. 960). Within Canada, dominant cultural identity has long been drawn from a conception of wilderness that paradoxically connects citizens, often through outdoor recreation, to a non-cultural and timeless conception of the landscape—"the True North strong and free" (Loo, 2001; Wadland, 1995). Significantly, the SE ethical framework based on deep ecology and the land ethic taken up by ORE shares some ideological ground, through Anglo-North American transcendentalism, with dominant nationalistic understandings of landscape, recreation and identity in Canada. While the links provide entry for environmentalism, researchers and practitioners in ORE have done little to critically examine the philosophical underpinnings as well as the key Canadian myths employed by this SE ethical framework. In an attempt to do so, I describe and explore the

dominant myths of the ideal wilderness landscape and experience, the skilled outdoorsman as idol and the canoe as an idyllic "Canadian" craft.

An examination of the myths and premises that shape the SE ethical framework provides the opportunity for constructive criticism. "Discussions about SE ethical frameworks are essential for moving towards a congruency between values and behaviour," Fox and Lautt (1996) state, "given the challenges of a diverse and changing society" (pp. 19-20). The critique draws on continental philosophy, ecofeminism, investigations into Canadian nationalism, as well as works that expose and document cross-cultural environmental conflict. I offer critiques from within ORE literature as well as outside voices that show deep ecology, the land ethic, and wilderness-centred recreation practices and myths to be reliant on antimodernism.

Antimodernism is used in art history, as Anderson (2001) explains, to describe a movement against the "ills" of modern society, increasing urbanisation, and industrialisation by celebrating the benefits of a return to Nature with an emphasis on "untouched" wilderness, direct experiencing, and the primitive. Antimodernism, as artistic expression, has been connected to a rise in the popularity of outdoor and wilderness recreation as rest-cure or therapy for hectic and stressful, increasingly urban modern life around the turn of the century in Europe, the United States and, somewhat later, in Canada (Humberstone & Pederson, 2001; Jasen, 1995; McCombs, 1995). Latour (1992/1993) explains that while antimodernism struggles fiercely against the effects of modernism by attempting to reverse "progress", it accepts the categories of separable nature and culture. Throughout the thesis I will use *(anti)modernism* to indicate that, while working against the consequences of modernity, the movement relies on, supports,

and reinforces the modern project. According to Ingold (2000) and Latour (1992/1993) the modern project becomes problematic when trying to address complex issues that mix the supposedly separate social and environmental realms. The term *modern* carries particular assumptions about the evolution of knowledge and the structure of human-nature relations that I am trying to explore. From the perspective of dwelling, to paraphrase Latour (1992/1993), none of us have ever been wholly modern. Therefore, the term *modern* is rather problematic, yet also useful in succinctly describing a particular argument for how humans apprehend the world. I use *Western* as a synonym for *modern.*

Problems also plague *Indigenous* and *Aboriginal* when used in opposition to *Western* or *modern.* Ingold (2000) argues that because the West conceives of these "the categorical opposition of indigenous and non-indigenous populations, conceived respectively as the descendants of natives and settlers, is itself a construction of colonialism" (p. 151). Following Daes (as cited in Ingold, 2000), writing on behalf of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations under the United Nations, I use *Aboriginal* and *Indigenous* to mean peoples who

> regard all products of the human mind and heart as interrelated, and as flowing from the same source: the relationships between the people and their land, their kinship with other living creatures that share the land, and with the spirit world. Since the ultimate source of knowledge and creativity is the land itself, all of the art and science of a specific people are manifestations of the same underlying relationships, and can be considered as manifestations of the people as a whole. (p. 150)

Furthermore, I must be clear that while I juxtapose *Western* and *modern* with *Indigenous* and *Aboriginal*, I do so as a way of comparing ways of being and modes of thought, not as strict categories based on race and lineage. Furthermore, people live with these overlapping categories and to distinguish between them is to introduce some notion of purity. Yet, in everyday life each of us must negotiate paradoxes, inconsistencies, and multiple conflicting realities.

The critique shows that despite the rhetoric of the SE ethical framework, it supports the (anti)modern split between nature and culture. Moreover, this rift has influenced thought and practice within ORE. For example, adventure programming as a section of the ORE field, purports to deal with interpersonal or intrapersonal development, health, growth, and change (Beringer, 2004; Priest, 1999). Adventure programming does this, as Beringer points out, with little regard to either the influence of the environmental context on personal change, or the influence of the activity on the environment in which it is located. Additionally, Haluza-Delay (1999) chides adventure programming practitioners for terse treatment of environmental awareness, often, he states, limiting it to the practice of minimum impact camping techniques. In practice, Haluza-Delay argues minimum impact camping, intended to encourage environmentally sound behaviour, reinforces "a certain notion of nature as a place 'out there' away from home" (p. 449). Moreover, according to Ryan (2002) and Haluza-Delay, "leave no trace" practices produce a way of thinking that externalises human society and the environmental impacts of technological devices (such as stoves that consume fossil fuels and are used instead of camp fires) from the wilderness experience.

Framing experiences around the split between nature and society binds ORE to a dichotomy that is at odds with some goals of ORE and, in a multicultural society, has traditionally been distinct to Anglo North-American thought. As I will show, a SE ethical framework that relies on a deep ecological understanding of wilderness, despite rhetoric to the contrary, continues to uphold the Anglo-North American distinction between nature and culture that ultimately leads to shortcomings when attempting to reconcile the resulting social and ecological realities (Guha, 1998; Ingold, 2000). Problematically, this has led to relatively insular divisions within ORE such as the distinction between adventure and environmental education seen prominently in ORE from the United States. An ability to explore the interrelatedness of culture and nature, I argue, will remain elusive so long as the concepts behind environmental and adventure programming remain framed relative to the *great divides*.

The two great divides are central to the problems that (anti)modernism brings to ORE. The first divide is the supposed separation between humanity and the non-human world, said to occur either by divine rite or "objective" rationalism.[3] Put another way, the first great divide is the assumed distinction between nature and culture. Arising from the first, the second great divide privileges Western (modern) cultures and distinguishes them from other cultures not just in form, but also in kind; that is, Western cultures are those that have "realised" or "achieved" the first great divide (Ingold, 2000). As will become apparent in the critique, the great divides place Western cultures in a supposed objective

[3] I contend, in this thesis, that objectivism is not a truly separate perspective or positioning as modern Western culture describes. Rather, from the dwelling perspective a semblance of objectivity depends *a priori* on an intimate connection and understanding of the things and context with which one works (Ingold, 2000). Far from the starting point of human perception (supposedly biased by socialization and culture), objectivity requires great effort, imagination, and self-reflection—as both Ingold (2000) and Latour (1992/1993) show—and therefore can only be strived for.

position that—when working cross-culturally—has the effect of undermining non-western peoples' ontological position by separating their culture from their context or environment. Such a repercussion occurs because the great divides are, in fact, ethnogenic. Their application becomes hegemonic when understood as universal truths by some members of Western culture.

Recognising that the great divides are ethnocentric and promote the separation of culture and nature, the achievement of certain goals within ORE require an approach not reliant on the great divides. I argue that teaching and learning a knowledge that binds people to places, as Raffan (1991) suggests ORE has failed to do, is one of these goals. By not assuming the great divides, the dwelling perspective sheds light on a pre-ethical and pre-scientific form of knowledge that "rests in the perceptual skills that emerge, for each and every being, through a process of development in a historically specific environment" (p. 25).[4] Further, Ingold states "these skills… provide a necessary grounding for any system of science or ethics that would treat the environment as an *object* of its concern…. And what these excavations into the formation of knowledge have revealed is not an alternative science, 'Indigenous' rather than Western, but something more akin to a *poetics of dwelling*" (p. 25). I thus look to how ORE might foster different poetics of dwelling that lead to different understanding and attachments to place.

---

[4] The notion of pre-ethical or pre-objective is somewhat problematic as surely our ability and skill in dealing with ethical issues and thinking "objectively" arises through our immersion in our environment. Ingold (2000) spends little time addressing the social skills and political skills involved in ethics. While this is not his focus, it is a side of his work that future research will need to address. How do we learn to act ethically or politically, what tools are brought into use, and how is landscape involved? Hence, we enter the world of place politics.

The themes of landscape, identity, and sense of place provide a starting point for developing an alternative SE ethical framework, henceforth referred to as a *heuristic framework*. These themes were selected because they speak to the current SE ethical framework but are also relevant to the contributions Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective might make to ORE. While a full heuristic framework will require multiple studies and years of work, I begin the process by addressing the role of skill in stitching together the main themes within the ORE literature reviewed. Skill seemed to be an apt starting point for two main reasons. First, ORE is largely focused and dependent on the development of practical, perceptual, and social skills. Second, the literature on deep ecology and the land ethic as well as landscape, identity, and sense of place within ORE has not addressed connections between skill and the perception of self, environment, and/or their interrelation.

Ingold (2000) is fundamentally concerned with dismantling the division between humanity and nature in order to correct what he understands to be a deep-seated flaw in mainstream anthropology. The schism between nature and culture in anthropology largely misrepresents what Ingold has learned, primarily but not exclusively from Indigenous peoples, about how humans perceive and relate to their environment. To address this shortcoming, Ingold proposes the *dwelling perspective* as a way of understanding the interplay of "nature" and "culture" and carries the perspective through a detailed and highly critical, yet productive, analysis of livelihood, dwelling, and skill. Two premises are central to Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective: first, process is given priority over form or, in other words, "life…is not the revelation of pre-existent form but the very process wherein form is generated and held in place" (p. 173). Second, the

dwelling perspective assumes "the agent-in-its-environment, or what phenomenology calls 'being in the world' as opposed to the self-contained individual confronting a world 'out there'" (p. 173). From this perspective, the meaning and forms of persons, places, and things emerge, grow, and are cultivated using skill and perception while inhabiting a world in which humans always already find themselves. Ingold argues that experiencing life, from within the dwelling perspective, is more than biological (natural) and more than historical (cultural); it is tantamount to participating in the co-generation of one's life world.

The dwelling perspective stresses abilities and processes of apprehension, attention, and perception by tenaciously positioning the individual *within* his or her ever-shifting world; aptitudes that Haluza-Delay (1999) has argued are lacking in ORE programming and students' learning. Ingold largely, but by no means exclusively, works through case studies of Indigenous peoples such as the Nuer of southern Sudan, Inuit of northern Quebec, and Umeda of Papua New Guinea. These groups have shown a way of being in the world that, while foreign to most Western individuals' conceptions and experience, does nonetheless apply and may in some regards "ring true" with experiences and practices in ORE. For example, McAvoy, McDonald, and Carlson (2003) stress the importance of understanding how sense of place and place attachment are related to sense of self and identity in negotiating wilderness and parkland management between European Canadians and First Nations in British Columbia. Such an example clearly demonstrates the struggle and negotiation that must occur in order to dwell within Western society. Working from studies and experiences with various Indigenous groups, Ingold discusses how landscapes come into being, are maintained, and change over time

through a complex web of environmental interactions that generate meaningful places as well as individual and group identity. This *temporality of landscape*, Ingold argues, is common to both Indigenous and Western cultures; the *interactions* differ, however, resulting in various places, meanings, and identities. A cogent description of how landscape, identity, and sense of place interrelate and actually function has yet to be presented within ORE despite a growing amount of research.

While mainly comparing and contrasting the dwelling with the dominant Western perspective, Ingold also draws on studies of American railway workers, the experiences of blind and deaf individuals within Western cultures, as well as orchestral musicians to support his arguments and exemplify the dwelling perspective. Ingold's interpretation of various Indigenous ontologies, and the commonalities between them, is presented in a way that speaks to and draws examples from Western culture. Ingold's theoretical work may enable dedicated practitioners and researchers in ORE to more deeply explore alternative ways of being within their own environment and through their own experiences. The dwelling perspective may help practitioners to "steer clear" of the shallow co-option that Oles (1995) so poignantly argues against.

In summation, the project began with a concern about, and desire to improve, the ability of ORE to achieve its social and environmental goals. I started by identifying the goals and values of the field. I then limited my concern to the goal of connecting people with places in order to promote socially and environmentally sustainable lifestyles. Next I sought out literature describing how ORE attempts to achieve this goal, I found and dealt with articles mostly espousing deep ecology and the land ethic, as well as others that echoed or critiqued these perspectives. I sought out points where Ingold's (2000)

description of the dwelling perspective might move off of, add to, better explain, or show critique of the manuscripts and theories at play. I did so by exploring how articles from ORE either resonate with or speak directly to particular Western conceptions of landscape, identity, and sense of place directed loosely towards explaining ORE and the development of environmental values. Using literature related to environmentalism, social justice, and ORE I critique the current position as (anti)modern. The publications, in my opinion, indicate the potential for an alternative framework to emerge. Through critique I recognise that a genuinely ecological perspective able to accommodate, refigure, and interrogate both nature and culture may advance the achievement of teaching types of knowledge that connect people to places and promote environmentally sustainable behaviour. With the ultimate intention of moving towards such an ecological framework, I interrogate current ORE research with the dwelling perspective in order to present a "first small step" that explains some of the interconnections and importance of a skill in relation to landscape, identity, and sense of place. Finally, implications of this work for future research, and further development of the emerging framework are described.

Chapter One: Methodology

Purpose of The Research

I came to this Master's research project after three years of international fieldwork in outdoor recreation, education and environmental education. I had been based in Kenya, the Turcs and Caisos Islands, Costa Rica, and Canada. I was left restless and dissatisfied by explanations and attempts to apply strict Western epistemology and knowledge to "environmental issues" in these disparate places. I returned to university to seek a different way of understanding what I had experienced over those three years.

I was not alone. Others in ORE and related disciplines such as anthropology (Ingold, 2000), history (Cronon, 1996), and sociology (Latour, 1992/1993) had been struggling with similar issues. After struggling with the idea and paradoxes of wilderness and their influence on ORE, I was left wanting a conceptual understanding of landscape. Multiple readings, writings and research have allowed me to describe the misgivings cited within the literature concerning the effectiveness of approaches that tend to separate the human realm from the natural realm when dealing with concepts of landscape, identity, and sense of place within ORE. Wanting to provide constructive critique, I began to search for an approach to ORE capable of recognising the role of both the human-human and human-land relationships. This research project reviewed approaches within ORE that resonate with deep ecology, as a prominent SE ethical framework currently in play, but found them to be (anti)modern, that is, based on the same categories of nature and culture used in modernism but with different valuation. Out of that exploration, I used Ingold's (2000) concept of skill to begin the development of an alternative heuristic framework, weaving together alternative understandings of

landscape, identity, and place that do not rely on the nature-culture dichotomy. Specifically, this was done with an eye to the Canadian context of ORE, though largely in response to the dominant theoretical work coming out of the United States.

The purpose of this study was threefold:

1. To examine and critique a socio-environmental ethical framework of outdoor recreation and education that resonates with deep ecology and the land ethic by tracking the nature-culture dichotomy.
2. To investigate the applicability of Ingold's (2000) *Perception of the Environment: Essays in Dwelling, Livelihood and Skill* to existing outdoor recreation and education research and theory as an alternative to the nature-culture approach to apprehending the relationship between humans and their environment.
3. Take a first step towards developing a heuristic framework for outdoor recreation and education based on the dwelling perspective by working through one aspect of Ingold's theory in relation to the outcomes of the critique and in connection to applicable ORE articles.

Epistemology/Ontology

Foundational for Ingold's (2000) theory and my critique of the nature-culture dichotomy within ORE was the notion that humans are always already beings-in-the-world, the founding principle of phenomenology. At the outset of my research I distinguished between phenomenology that is critical of culture, on one hand, and phenomenology that seeks to explore the culturally subjective experience, on the other. As Crotty (1998) explains, the first is critical of everyday experience and cultural structures of meaning, while the second seeks to describe everyday experiences with as

little prejudice from the researcher as possible. In celebrating the subjective, the second type—which is dominant in North America—is decidedly uncritical and given to narcissism. Given my focus on exposing how the nature-culture dichotomy, as a feature of dominant western culture, imposes and excludes meanings, serves certain interests over others, and harbours forms of injustice, I have been most certainly aligned with the former rather than the latter. As Crotty (1998) notes, critical phenomenology "is about saying 'No!' to the meaning system bequeathed to us" (p. 82) in order to reinterpret and reconstruct phenomena so as to give them new or different meaning.

Phenomenology invites direct experiencing of things themselves, apart from their "given" cultural meaning, so that both *culture* and the *thing* can be reinterpreted. As Crotty (1998) notes, phenomenology pursues the objects of experience rather than the experiencing subject. Yet this seems a blatant application of the nature-culture dichotomy I wish to address. I would be hypocritical to allow a "stripping away" of culture for methodological purposes but claim this to be impossible in ORE experiences. Yet as Ingold (2000) explains, there is a fundamental difference between phenomenological and Cartesian perspectives of culture. From the Cartesian perspective, culture is a set of rules and modes of behaviour conceived purely in human mind, laid upon objects, and acted upon the world (including human bodies). From the phenomenological perspective, things can only be encountered in an quasi-objective way by first engaging them in a world of meaning. "Only because we are… immersed in the world," Ingold (2000) states, "can we imagine ourselves as existing separately from it" (p. 169). This process of stepping back within one's life world, what St. Pierre (1997) in reference to Foucault calls "getting free of oneself," is not a rehashing of transcendent objectivism and an

attempt to know what is proper to know, but a creative curiosity that allows the questioning of the "structures of intelligibility" (p. 405). However, getting free of one's self does not preclude the nature-culture dichotomy.

Human existence, Being, and therefore phenomenology, Heidegger (as noted by Crotty, 1998) argues, are fundamentally an interpretive or hermeneutic process through which things acquire meaning and, therefore, culture develops.[5] In this way Heidegger gives priority to the process of meaning creation over the form of the meaning created. This distinguishes Heidegger's use of *hermeneutics* from the more common meaning of the term, which Crotty (1998) describes as the practice of interpreting existing cultural products.

Ingold (2000) brings together Heidegger's (1927/1962) reversal of the modern process-form relationship with anthropological studies of Indigenous peoples as well as analyses of architecture and artwork to describe how culture and subjectivity grow out of interactions within the life-world. Therefore the cultural meanings of individuals and things are not "given"; they emerge from dialogical human interaction in a field of relations. Deleuze and Guattari (as cited by St. Pierre, 1997) use the notion of a *haecceity* to describe such a co-assemblage of the subject in relation to the meaning of objects, time, and space.[6] Not only did this approach provide a way out of the modern conceptions of things—including people—as solid and static, but it also allowed me to critically reflect upon how nature and culture interact and produce or structure meaning

---

[5] *Being* denotes the existential state, as in that thing *is;* whereas *being* signifies an entity, as in a human being.

[6] *Haecceity* refers to the essence of what a thing is and what differentiates it from other things. Deleuze and Guittari (1987) state that "a haecceity has neither beginning nor end, origin nor destination; it is always in the middle. It is not made of points, only of lines. It is a rhizome" (p. 263). As such, things are always in a state of becoming.

within the (anti)modern perspective in ORE. Within my analysis, giving process precedence facilitated reinterpretation and experimentation with conceptions of practice and the meanings of places, such as wilderness, and things, such as canoes, within ORE.

From the dwelling perspective, ways of being give rise to different ways of knowing, which then reshape how one is and what one knows. Heidegger's phenomenological hermeneutics, and more pointedly the dwelling perspective advanced by Ingold (2000), rely on dialogic relations between all manner of things to generate understanding and meaning. "Rather than the clear separation of mind and matter," Borrie (1995) states, "Heidegger saw reality as being closely tied to unity of experience. He views objects and things as neither static nor essential. Rather, Heidegger believes other things find expression through the events of human existence" (Martin Heidegger's Background section, ¶ 2). Knowledge, in this sense, is alive and embodied in the interactions of beings with their life-world. Using Delueze and Guattari's figuration of the *rhizome*, both St. Pierre (1997) and Ingold describe how this understanding of knowledge and Being blur distinctions between epistemology and ontology. The rhizome is used to envisage a dense cluster of filaments that can interconnect at any point, creating transient interrelationships in a world of movement. Regarding the perception of one's environment, for example, Ingold describes the importance of continual movement by examining Indigenous wayfinding, a practice that allows the person to position and move him or her self in relation to their life world. The way the world flows around the individual helps them understand and develop a relationship between self and other. The filaments of the rhizome are representative of the relationships between persons, persons

and things, as well as the tenuous relationships between signified and signifier in language and the production of artefacts.

From the dwelling perspective, Ingold (2000) argues that knowledge is *grown* through an education of attention to and a sharing or entwining of perspectives within a field of relations. From this perspective, the path to and product of knowledge unfolds and enfolds with being alive to the world. Knowledge cannot be predicted in advance because, St. Pierre argues, inquiry and writing alter the author's perspective, lead him or her elsewhere, back again, and into the unknown.

Ingold (2000) suggests that in conducting day-to-day activities humans create lived relationships, out of which grow the meaning of specific persons, objects, and locations. In this vein, he compares two statements, one explicating the modern perspective and another the dwelling perspective. Using the following statement as an example of the modern perspective, Ingold (2000) quotes Geertz: "'man [sic]… is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun' (1973:5)" (p. 173). Further, Ingold (2000) juxtaposes Geertz's position with a statement by von Uexkull, who proffers that "'as the spider spins its threads, every subject spins his [sic] relations to certain characters of the things around him [sic], and weaves them into a firm web which carries his existence' (1957: 14)" (p. 174). Ingold believes that von Uexkull's position more closely exemplifies the dwelling perspective and the rhizomic structure of one's life-world. Dwelling, Ingold states, is "tantamount to the ongoing, temporal interweaving of our lives with one another and with the manifold constituents of our environment" (p. 348).

Meaning and knowledge, in the dwelling perspective, come about through immersed aesthetic experience and the development of skill within one's environment. *Aesthetic*, in this sense, is not limited to an appreciation of beauty but used to describe the bodily immersion and skilled sensual perception that allows a person to comprehend and function within its socio-environmental environment. Such immersion and perception underlies all forms of knowledge, including scientific (Ingold, 2000). Therefore knowledge and meaning are not the purview of an isolated human mind and static, but rather dependant on process and interrelation, that is, the tasks and skills of the individual in their environment.

Ingold's (2000) aim is to learn from hunter-gatherers about being immersed in the "dwelt-in world." He goes to great lengths to remind the reader that in elaborating the dwelling perspective largely through examples of Indigenous persons, practices, and livelihoods in contrast to the dominant Western perspective, his purpose

> is certainly not to argue for some distinctive hunter-gatherer worldview or to suggest that they are somehow 'at one' with their environments in a way that other peoples are not.... The contrast, I repeat, is not between alternative views of the world; it is rather between two ways of apprehending it, only one of which (the Western) may be characterised as the construction of a view, that is, as a process of mental representations. As for the other, apprehending the world is not a matter of construction but of engagement, not of building but of dwelling, not of making a view *of* the world but of taking up a view *in* it (Ingold, 1996a:117). (p. 42)

Research Design: Nomadic Wayfinding

Deleuze and Guattari (as cited in St. Pierre, 1997) describe how the rhizome frames the researcher as a *nomad*, working in a variety of unpredictable places and concerned with fluidity rather than unity of the topic of study. In this study I followed the flow of the nature-culture dichotomy into, out of, and through aspects of ORE literature. As a person maintained within the world of flux, I was continually redefined as I progressed while redefining that with which I worked. Similar to St. Pierre's (1997) description, the act of writing was more than a symbolic representation or a tracing of reality, writing changed my understanding and the way I moved with my work.

This project began with an interest in how ORE addresses the nature-culture dichotomy from a theoretical and ethical point of view. An understanding of the research design might be best served by using another geographic metaphor. The design is akin to the iterative process of *wayfinding*, as an exploration on foot, which leads me through different areas within ORE literature. Nomadic writing is a form of research that is concerned with wandering, getting lost, mapping the trail left behind, and surveying the unknown space ahead (St. Pierre, 1997). As Pile and Thrift (1995) note of wayfinding through literature, the "path is not meant to be definitive, but to raise questions about commonly assumed notions" (p. 2) that the researcher refuses to take for granted. In this way, I lay a path that became visible as I traveled, as opposed to following a route that lay ahead of me. Wayfinding necessitates going into unfamiliar territory and "risking the loss of those things we believe we cannot do without" (Spivak as cited in St.Pierre, 1997, p. 413). In the case of ORE, I risked critiquing the concept of wilderness.

My attention was drawn off the beaten path by an inviting gap in the trailside cover. Through field experience in a variety of activities, with people of various cultures, and in drastically different landscapes, I had became intrigued with how such experiences might effect the values and lifestyles of all those involved. I was particularly interested in social and environmental sustainability. Upon arriving at graduate school I was drawn to the non-Western Indigenous perspectives that Ingold (2000) brings to bear in the process enfolding culture and nature into a meaningful and potential-filled life-world. My initial experiences also led to academic articles that critiqued the normative goals and practices of ORE by calling into question a division within the field between the "social" and "environmental" realms. I was initially drawn to writings (Haluza-Delay, 1999; Raffin, 1991; Wearing & Neil, 2000) that addressed my interest in challenging the nature-culture dichotomy in a way that allowed for greater socio-environmental responsibility within ORE theory and practice. Much like a bushwhacking session going down a hill, I knew the general direction but had to constantly pick a particular way forward, often "zigzagging" around obstacles. Each article pointed in multiple directions, as spaces between trees do during bushwhacking, to reveal multiple paths not visible from a bird-eye-view.

In a sense, Ingold's (2000) work served as a prominent feature that guided my travels within the landscape and against which I could check progress and relate instances of the nature-culture dichotomy I encountered. I proceeded, in this way, to draw connections between various readings. This resulted in questions about identity, landscape, and sense of place as emergent waypoints or important themes within the ORE pieces I encountered.

In the following section on methods, I describe how Ingold's (2000) work served as a tool for Ingerson's (1994) method of *tracking* and *testing* the nature-culture dichotomy in ORE literature. Tracking involved identifying and exposing the dichotomy. Because the nature-culture dichotomy is assumed—from the dominant modern perspective—to be true, I equated Ingerson's *testing* with *evaluation*, presenting and identifying circumstances and critique that show the dichotomy to be fallacious, unethical, or misleading. Testing was not necessarily an empirical verification, though it could have been. The iterative process of tracking and testing involved closely reading articles from ORE and then using Ingold's work as a reference to expose assumptions as well as values in the article. Then I puzzled over how the author's position within the article fit with or critiqued the dominant themes emerging from the various other readings. In addition, I tried to expose strengths and/or weaknesses in the articles by assuming the dwelling perspective. The process of tracking, evaluating, and puzzling allowed me to begin to understand and explicate some ramifications of the dwelling perspective for ORE. These implications may help practitioners and researchers begin to use the dwelling perspective to facilitate greater connections between people and places, resulting in social and environmental responsibility without relying on the dichotomy of nature and culture. Furthermore, these preliminary suggestions point the way towards future research and exploration in order to more fully flesh out a heuristic model for ORE based on the dwelling perspective.

Methods

Tracking: towards (anti)modernism.

I made headway by tracking the nature-culture dichotomy, much like one tracks an animal in the snow, unsure of one's final destination. As Ingerson (1994) suggests, tracking the nature-culture dichotomy within scholarly communication is a method that allows one to recognise and articulate assumptions that structure discussions about nature and culture "even as scholars attempt to straddle the boundary between the two realms" (p. 46). Using Ingold (2000) as a sense of direction, a "touch-stone", I was able to show ways the nature-culture dichotomy manifests in the ORE literature. Seeing the nature-culture dichotomy within arguments, according to Ingerson, is the critical step to actually studying the dichotomy itself and breaking it down through testing. I tracked the nature-culture dichotomy in order to show that even ORE based on deep ecology and the land ethic straddles the boundary between nature and culture and, as of yet, has not sought out a single system that challenges the dichotomy.

Papers, books, and book chapters were located using various database searches, library catalogue searches, course reading lists, and reference lists from pertinent articles. I primarily used peer-reviewed articles from scholarly journals, though professional papers written by particularly salient authors (such as McAvoy, 1990) or articles that summarised scholarly work (such as the ERIC digest publications) were also used. Articles and books that exemplified or critically addressed the supposed distinction between Western and non-western cultures and/or between humanity and nature (either or both of the two great divides) were also used in tracking the nature-culture dichotomy.

As Sumara (2002) and Brown and Jones (2001) describe, keeping a research journal can help researchers to draw connections between various writings in relation to a particular topic; the journal acts as a site for the creation of knowledge. By using a journal I was able to record changing thoughts and connections between concepts. Reviewing past positions and thoughts within the journal helped guide me towards new positions. I recorded the main premises of articles, conceptual connections between writings, aspects related to the nature-culture dichotomy, and/or the goal of achieving socially and/or environmentally responsible behaviour and values in participants though connection to place.

Based on the approaches taken and suggested by Ingold (2000) and Ingerson (1994), the nature-culture dichotomy was evidenced by a number of factors within an article or argument. I also used articles and arguments from environmental sociology, environmental history, and environmental political philosophy to help me recognize problems and effects of the nature-culture dichotomy. Explicit mention of the nature-culture dichotomy was an obvious indicator. For example, Haluza-Delay (1999) includes a section on "the nature-civilization duality of our society" in a discussion of barriers to accomplishing the environmental goals of ORE. Assuming or describing nature and culture as mutually exclusive or making such assumptions problematic was also used in tracking the nature-culture dichotomy. Colwell (1997), for example, argues that assumptions such as the nature-culture distinction have been "of such crucial importance to environmental education that they have been taken for granted as unquestionable truths no longer in need of critical examination" (p. 4). Further, authors (Borrie & Roggenbuck, 1996; McAvoy, 1999) make explicit use of the nature-culture dichotomy by defining and

describing wilderness based on, yet also moving beyond, the United States' Wilderness Act as "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man[sic], where man[sic] himself is a visitor who does not remain" (as cited in Miles, 1999, p. 321).

The ecocentric-anthropocentric distinction was used to track the nature-culture dichotomy. As the following quotation shows, the ecocentric-anthropocentric debate frames the human situation relative to nature. Describing the similarities of experiential education and deep ecology, Horwood (1991) argues that both movements involve a "critical shift in central values. In the case of deep ecology, it parts from main-stream thought by shifting the centre of its concern from human beings to the biosphere.... Like deep ecology, experiential education tries to see things whole" (p. 23). Such a position seems to imply a shift from one extreme to another, away from humans and onto the biosphere, leaving a separation; a distanced and objective positioning that can provide an understanding of the whole. Furthermore, such a holistic approach essentializes the human experience by not recognising the relationships that connect one to and differentiate one from the Other, relationships that provide one's distinct personhood.

The deep-ecological idea of an ecocentric self, realised through identification brought my attention to ways that identity and the individual are conceived within ORE literature. Descriptions of self and identity portrayed understandings of the individual in relationship to nature and modern society. Identity was often positioned as "innately connected to nature" when individuals were supposedly able to shed their social and cultural situations. This has the effect of framing identity as cultural simulacra, totally suspended within a human-spun web of significance independent of the individual's body

and environment. Duenkel and Scott (as cited in Henderson, 1999) describe the role of adventure educators as "awakening the perception of how our every-day constructed reality has removed people from the natural world, as well as from the nature within" (p. 443).

As another indicator, romantic or primitivist perspectives were examined. Such arguments trace a supposed "point of human departure" from a state considered natural. Borrie and Roggenbuck (1996) discuss "primitiveness" as an essential quality of an authentic wilderness experience: "Wilderness, because it has been preserved in its natural state, is close to being the way it was when Europeans came to this country. It is our closest reminder of the state of nature from which we have evolved" (p. 36). Conversely, Hull (2000) argues against romantic bias in outdoor recreation that "celebrate[s] wild, untrammelled nature as a holy temple where one finds God, learns moral lessons, and retreats from civilization" (p. 54).

Similarities and connections between articles or chapters were explored through brainstorming and concept mapping using a "white board." Salient connections and revelations were further elaborated within the researcher's journal. To be consistent with my epistemology I adopted Ely, Vinz, Downing, and Anzul's (1997) approach to *composing* rather than *finding* or *seeing* meaning. I composed by using notes from my journal to help the process of writing and rewriting, followed with feedback and discussing topics with professors and peers. Ely et al. (1997) argue "writing about the same subject, over and over again, leads to discoveries—new ways of seeing, saying, and thinking about what it is that the writer is trying to understand" (p. 19).

The writing process also involved what Ely et al. (1997) refer to as *winnowing*, the cutting away of excess information to be able to more clearly and concisely portray the how different writings related to the nature-culture dichotomy. The analysis of the articles was emergent and ongoing, concurrent with the (re)reading, (re)writing, and winnowing process; an approach that Ely et al. argue is able to bring out themes and patterns. In this way I was able to revisit various articles, concepts, and topics to established a number of themes that authors used regularly to describe how participants in ORE became more socially and environmentally aware and responsible. The processes enabled the identification of overarching concepts that facilitated reducing the various themes to three, which seemed to work in consort and were also present in Ingold's work. The three themes were landscape, identity, and sense of place. Within ORE, dominant perspectives of each theme were examined and problematic, paradoxical, or unresolved elements drawn out. Moreover, a review of critiques called into question the (anti)modern approach to the three themes within ORE. Critiques of (anti)modernism and "loose ends" of themes were used as openings for aspects of Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective. Having tracked the presence of the nature-culture dichotomy within ORE literature, I was then able to use Ingold's work to evaluate the nature-culture dichotomy within concepts of landscape, identity, and sense of place.

Evaluating: away from (anti)modernism.

Once I established an argument for (anti)modernism as a basis for some of the prominent environmental theory and ethics of ORE, I looked to move beyond (anti)modernism towards a more forward-looking or productive perspective. Research and writing on sense of place within ORE literature seemed to be struggling to bring

together work on both identity and landscape, and hinted at a new direction which might allow ORE to better describe its function in creating social and environmental responsibility. I turned to Ingold's (2000) work for guidance in reassessing the assumptions within ORE research on sense of place, identity, and landscape.

I adopted Ingold's (2000) work, because, like deep ecology and the land ethic in ORE, it is directed towards refiguring the relationship between humans and their environment. However, it approaches the topic from a very different perspective. Unlike the philosophy of deep ecology and the land ethic, which Hay (2002) describe as primarily ideological and prescriptive, Ingold's theories, while inspired and reliant on philosophical positions, are grounded in anthropological, psychological, and ecological research. Moreover, Ingold refigures many strong influences on (anti)modern ORE including: Aboriginal life, the ecocentric-anthropocentric debate, the function of technology and its influence on environmental perception, as well as wayfinding and navigation, among others. Many of the examples, topics, and settings addressed in Ingold's work are very similar to those in ORE. His focus on the process of identity, landscape, and place formation may allow for more continuity and subtlety in how ORE practitioners and researchers understand and work within and across urban, rural, and 'natural' environments. Perhaps most appealing about this theory is the struggle Ingold maintains against ethnocentrism while trying to understand how humans perceive, relate to, learn from, and about their environment.

Alternative ontological positions, revealed in Aboriginal life, as well as theories and philosophy pertaining to Being and phenomenology were used, through Ingold's (2000) theory, to evaluate assumptions about and introduce a different approach to the

human-nature relationship. The themes of landscape, identity, and sense of place within ORE were juxtaposed to aspects of Ingold's theory so as to find entry for the dwelling perspective. Warren (2002), Haluza-Delay (1999), and Raffan's (1991) concern and trepidation regarding the nature and perception of place within a highly nomadic and transitory form of recreation, for example, provided entry for Ingold's work on wayfinding, local knowledge, and the development of meaning along paths and within networks. Further, this element of Ingold's theory—exemplified in the experience of the Inuit and Cree of North American, seafarers of Micronesia, and Walbiri of Western Central Australia—lends credence to Fishwick and Vining's (1992) phenomenology of recreation place.

The "new" approach to the themes and their scope was guided by Ingold's (2000) theory. Four main methods were used as a way of opening a space for Ingold's dwelling perspective. First, when form was given precedence over process, the relationship was reversed in order to describe the phenomenon as a process resulting in a form. Such a technique was used because of modernity's focus on essential form at the expense of examining the processes that give rise to form. The comparison of identity theories provides a good example. According to Beringer (2004), dominant psychological perspectives tend to frame identity as a stable attribute, or set of characteristics, associated with a particular person. Wearing and Neil (2000), on the other hand, describe identity as malleable, derived from an ever-changing aggregate of physical and social interactions. Wearing and Neil place process prior to form and, therefore, may connect more with the dwelling perspective.

Second, assumed or explicit dichotomies were rejected so as to explore how the dichotomy might collapse into unified whole. For example, much of the work within ORE on sense of place assumes either that place results from within the social setting (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000; Stokowski, 2002) or in response to the physical environment (Kaltenborn, 1997; Williams & Harvey, 2001). Yet if the dichotomy is rejected, senses of place could be understood as resulting from a physical interaction between the human body and components of the social/physical environment that shape the individual, social, and physical context in a particular way.

Third, if a dichotomy appeared unavoidable, I attempted to see the two sides as indicative of a continuum, not a dichotomy. The distinction between "natural" and "built" environments is an excellent example. ORE programming often distinguishes between the city and wilderness. From the dwelling perspective all places are built. The scope and intensity of human intervention in the building process, and the degree to which other elements prevail, varies along a continuum. Some areas, like wilderness, are built mostly in a human imagination, which shapes an environment (including the people who live in it) by working to maintain a lack of human presence. Arguably, rural landscapes tend to represent a middle ground in the interrelationship of the human and non-human. Furthermore, cities are hugely influenced by a human presence in a way that may overshadow the continuing contributions of the non-human.

Fourth, if a critique was offered or research was done that addressed or implied one of the great divides, I tried to explain how a similar approach could be extended to the other great divide. For example, work on self-construal is beginning to address the privilege given in psychological research to the Western concept of self as independent,

as opposed to interrelational (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Markus and Kitayama's work focuses on psychological differences between cultural understandings of self and Other, centring around a distinction between self as independent of or interrelated with Others. In this way, Markus and Kitayama have taken an important step in addressing how non-western cultures are described and researched relative to a dominant Western perspective. Markus and Kitayama limit their conception of the Other as well as us/we/self to humans. Within the dwelling perspective relational identity can be in relation to human and non-human persons, things, and objects. As Walker, Deng and Dieser (2001) suggest, the work on self-construal could be extended to investigate how people of different cultures construe self in relation to non-human things within their environment. Markus and Kitayama challenge the second great divide, the privilege afforded Western culture in describing other cultures and notions of the self. I am suggesting, as are Walker et al., that a similar approach could be extended to the first great divide, the supposed separation of humans from nature.

Moving: towards a heuristic framework.

Evaluating the nature-culture dichotomy within the themes of ORE simultaneously enabled me to further pursue certain relevant aspects of dwelling perspective. I specifically looked for theoretical and conceptual as well as practice-oriented linkages between ORE and Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective. Knitting the themes together within the dwelling perspective, the most prominent facet I used was Ingold's interpretation of skill. Aspects of the section on dwelling (such as the temporality of landscape and building) as well as livelihood (such as the importance of spheres of nurture and exchanges of substance) were also used in relation to skill. A

theoretical and conceptual linkage, for example, was made between Fishwick and Vining's (1992) conceptualization of place and sense of place as networked and historical and Ingold's notion of places as meeting points, or centres, within paths of travel. A practice-oriented linkage was explored between Ingold's description of tools, technology, and their effects on environmental perception and that of the (anti)modern perspective (Potter and Henderson, 2001; Henderson, 1997). Importantly, I also explored how ORE would be affected by Ingold's descriptions of how practice and theory merge in performative, reflexive forms of knowledge. Ingold's distinction between the use of technology and tools to guide perception further into or away from landscape bears upon value judgements and the ways ORE develops pro-environmental values and behaviours. None of these points of convergence are simple matters. Because my intention is to describe implications of the dwelling perspective, I address certain linkages but do not claim to present a complete explication. Further explanations will be the fodder of future research.

In addition to Ingold's (2000) book and the various papers from within ORE, I used supporting works to fortify conceptual connections between themes as well as inform possible applications of the dwelling perspective to ORE. Initial references for supporting material were found in Ingold's book and were read in order to further develop connections and applications for developing socio-environmentally responsible behaviour through connections to place. For instance, Heidegger's *Origin of The Work of Art* (1960/1993) and *Building Dwelling Thinking* (1954/1993) contain concepts and arguments that Ingold either does not use in his arguments (such as the concept of the *fourfold*, attending to the interrelationships of the earth, sky, humans and spirituality) or

uses without enough elaboration for my purpose (such as the process of building place and making one's self at home).

While the dwelling perspective opens up new possibilities within ORE, my intent was not to build yet another dichotomy between the dwelling and the modern perspective. While discussing dwelling in industrial society Ingold (2000) states

> The dwelling perspective has not been *replaced* by the commodity perspective. Indeed the whole thrust of my argument is to the contrary—namely that task orientation… is the primary condition of our being at home in the world. As such, it constitutes the baseline of sociality upon which the order of modernity has been built, and from which we have now to come to terms with it. (p. 333)

My own intent was to show that the dwelling perspective might open possibilities for ORE to better achieve the elusive goal of connecting people to places in order to create environmental responsibility. Even Western ORE leaders and participants who are most receptive to Ingold's theory most likely live in both the modern and dwelling perspective. By comparing the lifestyle of the pastoral Nuer of southern Sudan (Evans-Pritchard as cited in Ingold, 2000) with life in industrial society, Ingold argues that "we are not Westerners, nor are we really non-Westerners; rather, we are human beings whose lives are caught up in the painful process of negotiation between these extremes, between the dwelling and commodity perspectives" (p. 338). By understanding both orientations, practitioners of ORE may be better able to achieve effective programs, make informed choices between activities, teach skills differently, and be more subtle and decisive in the use tools and technology depending on the objectives of the program. Moreover, the

dwelling perspective helps forward a commitment already present within ORE to developing not only values and intentions but also an ethic of practice.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was threefold. First, I set out to track manifestations of the nature-culture dichotomy, showing them to be problematic in attempting to connect people with places in ways that create socio-environmentally responsible values and behaviour. Specifically, I examined a dominant ORE ethical framework that is based on deep ecology and the land ethic. Second, I tried to show points and ways in which Ingold's dwelling perspective is applicable for ORE practice and theory. Third, based on Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective I wanted to take an initial step toward a heuristic framework that need not rely on the nature-culture dichotomy and that may help guide future thought and action in ORE.

Grounded in Heidegger's (1927/1962, 1954/1993, 1960/1993) philosophy, this research project assumed a hermeneutic approach to phenomenology in which knowledge is created through humans' interactions with their environment. Using Deleuze and Guattari's (as cited in St. Pierre, 1997) figurations of the rhizome, nomad, and haecceity, this project took up St. Pierre's (1997) approach to meaning creation through writing as a nomadic research practice. Therefore, I approached this research as a kind of wayfinding. Following Ingerson's (1994) proposal, the nature-culture dichotomy was tracked through scholarly research and writing within ORE by using a research journal, concept mapping, and Ely et al.'s (1997) methods of (re)writing and winnowing to produce the main themes of landscape, identity, and sense of place. Tracking allowed manifestations of the nature-culture dichotomy in these themes to be evaluated based on Ingold's (2000) dwelling

perspective and critiques from related literature. The evaluation proceeded by attempting to give priority to process rather than form, rejecting dichotomies in favour of unified systems, seeking continuums rather than poles, and expanding on both great divides. This process allowed research within ORE to be identified that might provide entry for the dwelling perspective. Co-emergent with the critique was a description of how skill, based on the dwelling perspective, might refigure and tier together the themes of landscape, identity, and sense of place as they relate to ORE thought and practice.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

The purpose of the literature review is to track the continued influence of the nature-culture dichotomy in the research and practice of ORE and when possible, to provide Canadian examples. I begin by exploring a division in ORE between environmental and social realms. Various authors (Beringer, 2004; Haluza-Delay, 1999; Hanna, 1995; Raffan, 1991; Sasidharan, 2002) seeking to foster responsible social and/or environmental thought and practice identify and explain the affect of this division. I am specifically interested in the goal of connecting people with places in ways that foster socially and environmentally responsible values and behaviours as clearly identified by Raffan. I contend that the influence of the nature-culture dichotomy within ORE research and practice has stunted the achievement of this goal. As emerging areas of study addressing this objective, landscape (wilderness), identity, and sense of place form the main themes through which I trace the influence of the nature-culture dichotomy. Intended as constructive criticism, this chapter attempts to open a space for Ingold's (2000) contribution to ORE.

First addressed on a broad theoretical level, the themes are more deeply contextualised within the Anglo-North American wilderness tradition in Canadian ORE, pulling together relevant works on adventure education, environmental education, and recreation resource management. I use dominant Canadian myths/practices to both exemplify and critique the themes. I look to the deep ecology movement (Dustin, 1990; Henderson, 1994, 1997, 1999; Henderson, 1990; Horwood, 1991; Quinn & Scott, 1997) and the land ethic (Dustin, McAvoy, & Shultz, 1991; Leopold, 1948; Lo, 2001) as dominant, if somewhat conflated, approaches within ORE literature that seek to "close"

the nature-culture dichotomy. The influence of American transcendentalism is described as a connection between dominant Canadian practice and the American wilderness tradition exemplified in the use of deep ecology and the land ethic in ORE. A summary of how the nature-culture dichotomy is manifest within wilderness, identity, and sense of place in the Anglo-North American wilderness tradition is provided.

Examining the influence of the nature-culture dichotomy is important, because it may bring assumptions, paradoxes, and consequences to light that often remain unexamined but which have the potential to undermine the efforts of researchers and practitioners in achieving their goals. I look to critiques of the contributing myths and philosophical traditions within the SE ethical framework and argue that they show an (anti)modern approach to addressing the nature-culture dichotomy. While the (anti)modern mind set and dominant myths play an important role in ORE and continue to be effective for many people and in many ways, they are also ethnocentric and harbour particular assumptions about the world and humanity that can be damaging to others. To show this, I describe how (anti)modernism reinforces the two great divides and, in some ways, contributes to the wound ORE set out to heal, namely, the supposed alienation of humans from nature. Moreover, because this dominant ideology perpetuates the great divides it reinforces a disjuncture between the practice and socio-environmental values of ORE in Canada. (Anti)modernism, a reaction to the industrialisation of society, is not the only perspective and is itself preceded and accompanied by dwelling. By shifting away from the aporia of the nature-culture dichotomy and into the dwelling perspective, practitioners and researchers raised and schooled in Western traditions may find that Ingold's (2000) work helps open a new way of thinking, dealing with issues, and striving

towards goals. I am interested in how, by nurturing the dwelling perspective, ORE may be able to foster socio-environmentally responsible participants by supporting meaningful person-place relationships in a way that more suitably matches the values and context of ORE in Canada today.

Working within the dwelling perspective will not come easily—for the weight of modernity is great—but from struggling to actively engage and apprehend one's environment differently. If ORE is to take Aboriginal perspectives seriously, and learn from non-western ways of life, then the dwelling perspective cannot be taken lightly or dismissed as an alternative to a Western cultural construction of reality, for we too dwell. If Westerners are to learn from the dwelling perspective, Ingold (2000) states,

> we need to think again about our *own* ways of comprehending human action, perception and cognition, and indeed about our very understanding of the environment and or our relations and responsibilities towards it. Above all, we cannot rest content with the facile identification of the environment—or at least its non-human component—with 'nature'. For…the world can only be 'nature' for a being that does not inhabit it, yet only through inhabiting can the world be constituted, in *relation* to a being, as its environment. (p. 40)

Definitions and Structures Within ORE

This section begins by revealing the influence of the nature-culture dichotomy within the broad structure and theoretical approaches of ORE. I proceed by examining how definitions, dominant theoretical perspectives, and assumptions regarding identity, sense of place, and wilderness are shaped in the image of the nature-culture dichotomy.

I explore ORE as the space shared by outdoor *recreation* (OR) and outdoor *education* (OE). Ford (1981) defines OR as "all those leisure experiences in the out-of-doors that are related to the use, understanding, or appreciation of the natural environment…"(p. 18). As a form of *leisure*, participants freely choose OR activities that they find intrinsically rewarding. OR usually refers to human-powered activities such as cross-country skiing, kayaking, and hiking (Ewert & Galloway, 2001). [7] As a subset of OR, Ewert and Galloway (2001) highlight *adventure* recreation as human-powered activities that incorporate risk into the leisure setting. Ford, by using the terms *understanding* and *appreciation*, appears to be arguing that outdoor recreation has the potential for more than hedonistic enjoyment, that activities can teach participants to understand and appreciate the landscape in which they recreate. Dustin et al. (1991), Henderson (1987), and McAvoy (1990) all appear, in my opinion, to "pick up" Ford's educational component in their arguments to justify an environmental value-laden position for outdoor *recreation*.

Ford (1981) defines OE as teaching and learning "in, about, and for the out-of-doors" (p.12). While there is significant debate, many definitions tend to emphasise a holistic form of education that attends to four key relationships: with self as individual, between individuals, within an ecosystem, and between society and "the environment" (Ford, 1981; Priest, 1986, 1999; Priest & Gass, 1997). Furthermore, as argued by Ford (1986) and Priest and Gass, adventure education (AE) and environmental education (EE) can be seen as fields at least partially, if not entirely, within OE. AE is that portion of OE which uses real and perceived risk in activities, such as white water rafting,

---

[7] From the management perspective outdoor recreation research also examines mechanized activities such as snow machining, dirt biking, and water skiing in their relation with human-powered activities.

mountaineering and ropes-courses, in order to achieve learning predominantly about intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships; AE therefore deals with concepts of self and identity (Priest, 1999). Yet these interpersonal relationships are bounded, to a large extent, to those individuals within the educational program. Rarely do we formally address and acknowledge the interpersonal relations that occur between "locals" and resident raft guides, for example, the economic issues and conflicts and/or benefits that arise between town's people and visiting program participants and instructors. In reference to Ford's definition of outdoor education Potter and Henderson (2001) explain that in the Canadian context, adventure and environmental education—as subsets of outdoor education—are somewhat less distinct than is assumed in the United States. The authors argue that perhaps outdoor education should be described as education *of* and *with* the outdoors.

Within OE, EE uses games and volunteer programs, scientific study, and natural as well as cultural *interpretation* in conjunction with less adventurous outdoor pursuits (e.g., hiking, canoeing, and snow-shoeing) to teach about ecosystems and their relationships to society (Miles & Priest, 1999). Interpretation is an educational practice within EE that attempts to foster the social value of and an ethics of care towards interacting with nature as well as an appreciation of the effects of human activity on nature and local cultures (Wearing & Archer, 2002). EE predominantly addresses topics such as pollution, ecological diversity, flora and fauna identification, and sustainable lifestyles (Miles & Priest, 1999; Russell, Bell, & Fawcett, 2000). Russell et al. encourage Canadian educators to debate human-environment relationships, especially the appropriate application of the predominant scientific/analytic paradigm in a monocultural

field dominated by a white middle-class vision. Moreover, Russell et al. critique the distinction between "shallow" and "deep" theories and practices as not only being divisive but also "white-washing" the complexities inherent in environmental education. Russell et al. call for the emergence of environmental justice as a theme that embraces a diversity of narratives. Hitherto, they suggest challenging dominant anti-environmental myths present in curricula.

I focus on "human-powered" activities and their settings as a common ground shared by AE and EE within OE as well as OR. Both OR and OE occur on, in, and with oceans, rivers, lakes, prairies, and mountains in urban, suburban, rural and wilderness settings. I am particularly interested in how activities are thought of or used for teaching and fostering socially and environmentally responsible behaviour in participants regarding the settings in which they find themselves. That is, I am interested in the overt educational experience of OE as well as the implied educational experience within the leisure context of OR both of which are connected to and share particular human-powered activities.

Authors (Haluza-Delay, 1999; Kivel, 2000; Priest & Gass, 1997; Roberts & Rodriguez, 1999; Sasidharan, 2002) argue that the outdoor recreation industry is not living up to its potential as a force for positive social/environmental change; at times it is viewed as antithetical to the environmental movement, and appears to be inaccessible to racial as well as cultural diversity. A lack of attention to the possible interconnection of human growth with social and environmental context is seen as counter productive to the goals of ORE (Beringer 2004; Haluza-Delay, 1999; Hanna, 1995; Henderson, 1990; Kivel, 2000; Raffan, 1991; Roberts and Rodriguez, 1999). There appears to be significant

critique regarding existing assumptions that ORE develops an environmental concern, care for others, and self-knowledge in participants. Following an extended field-study of the idea of "land-as-teacher," Raffan pointedly states that outdoor education has failed to achieve its paramount goal of creating environmentally active individuals, because it has not focused on teaching forms of knowledge which serve to bind individuals and groups to place.

Assuming that the way practitioners and participants apprehend their environment reflects and is reflected in their SE ethical framework, then communicated understandings of landscape, individual, self, and identity become important in both defining the parameters of and achieving meaningful relationships between participants and places. What things, in Ford's (1981) definitions, are included in society or the environment? What distinguishes the individual from their environment? How is a sense of place different from or similar to a sense of self?

Ford's (1981) definitions reflect the nature-culture dichotomy that structures the ontology of ORE. In reference to the "natural environment," the terms *in* and *use* within Ford's definitions position the participant relative to the setting, and assume that one could be exterior to or without the use of a natural environment. This structures the natural world as not only different in kind from a human-built setting but also the participant. *About*, *for*, *understanding*, and *appreciation* structure the purpose and actions of participants and show how germane the idea of developing relationships between people and "the natural environment" is to ORE. Education *about* the out-of-doors implies a distanced learning of something that can be known, while *for* seems to imply a paternalistic, non-mutual relationship. Both Ford and Priest (1986, 1999) argue that OE

teaches personal, interpersonal, ecological, and ekistic relationships, a list that appears to be comprehensive. However, the list actually restricts understanding to that nature-culture dichotomy. For instance, Ford presupposes that ecological relationships are different in kind from interpersonal relationships. Ford's definitions perpetuate a distinction in kind between society and nature predicated on humans being essentially noetic and detached from their environment. Significantly, these divisions structure not only ORE programs and myths, but also participant's orientation to and perception of their environment.

Program efficacy in creating pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours through place attachment has been hindered, according to Haluza-Delay (1999) and Hanna (1995), by the growing split between the social/personal and the environmental/ecological realms of ORE. As an attempt to overcome some of these distinctions, Hanna calls for outdoor programs and research that further recognizes the complex interdependence of the physical land and social relationships. Specifically, she notes that sustainable changes in participant environmental attitudes and knowledge do occur from ORE programs, but research and practice that remain within traditional boundaries of AE and EE cannot explain the factors leading to these changes.

Canadian outdoor adventure education, Potter and Henderson (2001) argue, integrates wilderness travel with curriculum elements *for* and *about* the highly variable Canadian landscape, thereby incorporating interdisciplinary subject matter (biology, geography) and heritage skill development (history, literature, native studies) into an experience of outdoor adventure education. In reviewing the institutions that offer outdoor adventure education, Potter and Henderson note a lack of graduate programs

indicative, they believe, of Canada's more practical and less theoretical contributions to the field of adventure education.

Overcoming the distinction between AE and EE is more than a matter of merging programs, because according to Bunting and Townley (1999) the nature-culture dichotomy is entrenched in how the field of ORE structures not only its programming but also its philosophy and language. Wearing and Archer (2002), for example, attempt to include elements of AE in the interpretive practices of EE but inadvertently expose the philosophical depth of the nature-culture divide. Wearing and Archer argue for including elements of AE that teach social skills while providing an "experience of nature in its rawest form, and the ability to interact with nature with no imposed values" (p. 43). To me, *rawest form* places landscape as object to be processed, and *interact...with no imposed values* implies that ethical and moral development is purely within the isolated human mind and not a matter of action in the world. Moreover, as Beringer (2004) argues, a knowledge of nature as a real raw objective thing is highly problematic, because human physiology, cognition, and perception are intertwined to a degree that experiences always, and can only, result in interpretations of our perception. Therefore, I conclude that proponents of overcoming the distinctions within the field are not faced with a matter of reconciling two categories. They are faced with writing, speaking, and acting a different ontology. As a way of exploring a different ontological perspective, I seek to challenge the philosophical assumptions and cultural myths within deep ecology and the land ethic as foundations for an SE ethical framework within ORE that has already made significant attempts to overcome the nature-culture dichotomy.

I wish to address how Devall and Session's (1985) deep ecology and/or Leopold's (1948) land ethic have been used as an argument for the social and environmental importance of ORE (Dustin, 1990; Dustin, McAvoy & Shultz, 1991; Henderson, 1999; Horwood, 1991). Both the land ethic and deep ecology are discussed, because they share longstanding influences that are also common to ORE. Such inspirations include Leopold's (1948) writings, First Nations epistemology (Devall and Sessions, 1985; Jostad, McAvoy, & McDonald, 1996), and American transcendentalists such as Muir, Thoreau and Emerson (Sessions, 1995; Turner, 2002). The philosophy of deep ecology and the land ethic also share the common goal of connecting people with nature so as to increase environmental advocacy and ecological awareness with ORE (Henderson, 1990; McAvoy, 1990; Turner, 2002). I believe that this common goal and shared influences have led to these two movements being conflated in ORE practice. Moreover, these common influences carry with them conceptions of identity, landscape, and sense of place that have influenced ORE and the pursuit of this shared goal.

Identity

This section argues that a lack of critical attention to the concept of identity as interrelational within a socio-environmental context has resulted in three problems: (a) A disjuncture exists between research and practice, on one hand, and the stated values of ORE, on the other; (b) opportunities have been missed to achieve the goal of connecting people with place; and (c) the nature-culture dichotomy is reinforced through the distinction between AE and EE. Further, I describe deep ecology and the land ethic as approaches to identity that seek to overcome these difficulties by establishing an ecocentric identity. Moreover, I present Wearing and Neil's (2000) approach to show that

identity is a viable concept used to connect people and places in order to foster pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours.

In a study of SE ethical frameworks and moral practices within ORE, Fox and Lautt (1996) identify core values shared between outdoor recreation, outdoor education, environmental education, and experiential education. These values include "respect, social responsibility, self-actualization, justice, and freedom for all living beings and the Earth" (p. 19). Aware of the danger in normalizing a particular form of human-object relations, Fox and Lautt suggest a critical examination of how these core values are being supported in practice and research. While Fox and Lautt do not address identity in particular, a serious commitment to justice, social responsibility, self-actualisation, and freedom requires ORE to evaluate how subtle forms of inequity and hegemony may be perpetuated through theory and practice related to identity.

According to Kivel (2000) leisure is now seen as building inequality through the perpetuation of dominant notions of identity and sense of self. Kivel argues that leisure research naturalize differences by analysing dominant categories such as race, disability, and gender while ignoring the processes behind identity formation within, and impacting on, the leisure experience. Leisure research, in striving to explore commonalities and variations in leisure experience, often reproduces the impression that markers of identity are real and that an individual's identity is fixed. When put into practice, Kivel argues, such a notion prevents or distracts researchers from exploring the processes through which identity and difference are produced. Kivel's work calls ORE research to address the discursive and social aspect of identity *formation*. As a proponent of cultural studies, Kivel calls for analyses of the dominant discourses within leisure that build and maintain

identities and social categories. As Kivel notes of such assumptions "it is precisely the 'common sense' usage of these social categories—these markers of identity—that may, ironically, reinforce the construction of hegemonic identities within leisure contexts" (p. 80). A critical examination of concepts that structure and shape ideas of difference and identity can be extended beyond the opposition of social construction and natural endowment to focus on the common sense use of *natural* and *social* in Western thought. One way this can be perused is by learning from Indigenous ontological positions. Without such critique and reflection, Western researchers may continue to unknowingly deny the reality and power of identity-forming relationships that humans have with their more-than-human environment, such as those of the Ojibwa that Ingold (2000) explores. Discussing dominant conceptions of identity in adventure education and research, Beringer (2004) argues "the role of nature as a force in human development needs to be considered" (p. 51). Given the environmental crisis, "the relational or ecological self—the self embedded in, and defined by, human and nature relationships," Beringer (2004) concludes, "is a more viable conceptualization for our time" and "adventure learning and programming is well positioned to champion such an ecological redefinition" (p. 63). Pursuing such self-examination and critique may be one important way to work towards the core values of justice and freedom outlined by Fox and Lautt (1996).

Beringer (2004), from a therapeutic perspective, makes the point that understanding substantial changes experienced by participants in adventure programs may be limited by ignorance regarding the influence of the physical setting on self and identity development. AE programming is founded upon dominant psychological perspectives of identity-formation that focus on human aspects and leave aside the study

of nature (Beringer, 2004). EE programming uses natural science to study environmental issues and the "natural" landscape, in which human influence tends to be construed as impact or harm. The relatively restricted focus in AE and EE on social and natural relationships, respectively, reinforces the nature-culture dichotomy. According to Beringer (2004), an ecological or relational perspective that accounts not only for human-human relations but also human-nature relations is essential for bridging the two sides of OE and understanding the psychological interconnections of human and environmental health. By *assuming* that identity is isolated and stable, ORE researchers and practitioners may miss important avenues for developing meaningful connections between people and places, thereby diminishing changes in pro-environmental values and behaviours.

Issues of identity within deep ecology and the land ethic relate to anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. An anthropocentric position is one that posits human interests and perspectives as paramount, while an ecocentric position is one in which human interests and perspectives acquiesce to those of the ecosystem (Devall & Sessions, 1985). Both deep ecology and the land ethic, as practiced within ORE, describe how an ecocentric perspective can lead participants to express concerns and act on behalf the ecological community. Both deep ecology and the land ethic approach the goal of creating pro-environmental values and behaviours through the "wilderness experience."

Deep ecological ORE posits that the wilderness experience allows participants to *identify* with the land through what Sessions and Devall's (1985) claim to be the universal norms of deep ecology: *ecocentricity* and *self-realisation*. According to Capra (1995), a deep ecological ethic is based on the realization that the "value in all living nature stems from the deep ecological awareness that nature and the self are one" which

he equates with "the very core of spiritual awareness" and thus concludes that "ecological awareness is spiritual in its deepest essence" (p. 20-21). The connection between ecocentric awareness and spirituality, as oneness, resonates strongly with authors such as Borrie and Roggenbuck (1996), Harper (1995), Henderson (1987, 1989, 1999), and Turner (1996) who associate spiritual aspects of the wilderness experience with greater ecological awareness and identification.

Deep ecology within ORE draws on the idea of self-actualization or self-realisation as a state of having reached full human potential that enables identification. Self-realisation, as Naess (1995) describes, is the result of a quest for one's unique spiritual/biological personhood as way of being in the world; it is an understanding of the self as connected to all things on earth. Naess (1995) believes that "the ecological self of a person is that with which this person identifies" (p. 227). "Ecocentric religions" such as different Native American "religions," Taoism, and Zen Buddhism are often employed as expressions of deep ecology and are instrumental in self-realisation (Sessions, 1995a, 1995b). According to Naess (1995), once self-realisation occurs an individual *identifies* with the ecosystem as a part of his or her self, and vice versa, and is therefore able to speak and act on behalf of the ecosystem as a part of the self. Yet little is said about *how* one comes to identify with things, places, and an ecosystem through ORE. In a critique of how deep ecology is practiced within ORE, Ryan (1999) describes this as a kind of ventriloquism available only to a select few people.

Ecopsychology recognises the importance of place connection to human well-being in forming relationships with the rhythms of nature (Harper, 1995; Henderson, 1999; Ingold, 2000). Harper's (1995) and Henderson's (1999) approach to ecopsychology

seems to assume that humanity has a latent biological or spiritual connection with nature that culture has occluded, resulting in the estrangement of individuals from their environment. This approach appears to rely on the first great divide. The first great divide can be seen in how practitioners seek to reconnect a sense of self with a sense of place by, as Henderson (1999) variously refers to it, "draw[ing] out ancestral sensibilities within"(p. 443), embarking on a "cultural adventure" that takes "people to a place (a way of being, knowing, and valuing) where their day-to-day culture is not…an altered liminal cultural space" (p. 442). Therefore deep ecology appears to assume that these connections are either latent within the individual or the landscape. This approach has worked, to an extent, but assumes *a priori* two types of place and place attachment, natural and cultural. Attachment to wilderness is natural whereas to a city it is cultural. To the deep ecological perspective, place attachment lies in the *kind* of place. Similarly, there seem to be two kinds of self: a natural self, at home in the wilderness, and a cultural self, which belongs in the city. Reconciling the two may be difficult and might be understood as comparing "apples with oranges." According to this line of thought, lessons learned in the wilderness belong in the wilderness to my natural self; those learned in the city belong in the city and apply to my cultural self.[8] The unfortunate effect being that such an approach directs attention away from the processes of interaction and interrelation that result place creation and attachment. ORE practitioners and researchers concerned with influencing participant lifestyle, working equitably across cultures, and exploring Western culture beyond the dominant epistemology may want to look to the process of place and identity creation.

---

[8] This starts down the slippery slope of primitivism and the hegemony of the second Great Divide. Those who live in the wilderness are, from this perspective, more natural and less civilised. From the deep ecological perspective value is placed not on civilisation but on more natural lifestyle.

Leopold (1948) suggests that recognising the intrinsic value of land, plants, animals, and the integrity of an ecosystem as a whole and not simply as property is a natural extension for expanding the scope of ethical consideration. Leopold (1948) offers his now-famous maxim for ethical environmental consideration "a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise" (p. 262). According to McAvoy (1990), Leopold's land ethic provides an ecocentric approach to environmental ethics in that "as a plain member of the community [of the natural world] (and not the master of the community) humans owe respect and a duty to each other member of that community" (p. 69).

The land ethic attempts to combine perspective taking with empathy as a way of broadening the ethical community and connecting humans to their surroundings in order to achieve understanding and environmentally responsible behaviour from participants (Walker & Chapman, 2003). Walker and Chapman suggest that if OR participants are able to take the perspective of a park, animal, or ecosystem they may feel empathy for that entity within the given circumstances and therefore adopt attitudes and behaviours to protect it from harm.

From a deep ecological perspective, identification appears to occur through accessing a spiritual core that is common to all life. From the land ethic, identification can occur through taking the perspective of the other. Yet neither perspective within ORE has, to my knowledge, posited or dealt with how identity is created or maintained. Importantly, ORE programs have impacts on development of self-concept and identity (Beringer, 2004; Haggard & Williams, 1991; Klint, 1999; Pohl, Borrie, & Patterson, 2000).

Hanna (1995) contends that research in ORE has not yet attended to how an adventure experience influences the role of the setting within the self-concept of a participant. Both Hanna and Haluza-Delay (1999) have made clear that shifts in identity-related environmental thinking and attitudes require specific attention and focused educational programming. Other researchers (Kelly, 1983; Shogan, 2002; Wearing & Neil, 2000) have made significant strides in connecting identity with the settings and structures of recreation experiences, though not focused specifically on pro-environmental values. Wearing and Neil's work on identity formation may provide a way to proceed that recognises interconnections within a cultural context, yet still provides for important differences and agency.

Wearing and Neil (2000) decentralise and destabilize the notion of fixed personal identity "as a passive carrier of meaning and object of rational discourse"(p. 400). The move opens up the possibility of identity development based on continual and unpredictable worldly interactions in which self and society are in dynamic and dialectic interaction characterized by movement between self and other. This movement creates meaning and formulates an individual's desire to experience the world. According to Wearing and Neil the "first passion" of humans is *wonder*, which acts as the motivating force behind exploring the meaning of "the self and other-world in relation, through the body senses" (p. 400). By moving to understand identity as evolving within life-world relationships, Wearing and Neil begin to explore the effects of landscape on the concept of self and create a point of entry for ideas of relational concepts of self and identity within ORE. Wearing and Neil's work suggests the possibility of establishing

recreational practices that may facilitate the connection of identity over time to a particular landscape and set of environmental values.

Work by Shogan (2002) has begun to explore, from a cultural studies perspective, how the setting and form of an activity influences the identities accommodated and brought about within a recreational experience. The norms, rules, equipment, and myths of an activity shape its meaning and frame the way individuals create and structure relationships relative to their social and physical setting (Shogan, 2002). ORE in Canada is often framed and structured around dominant ideas of national identity (Potter & Henderson, 2001). While I do not propose a cultural-studies perspective, I believe that Shogan's work lends further support to the idea that these nationalistic myths create and structure participant experiences, and should be critically examined within the context of ORE goal achievement. Connections between Canadian nationalism and outdoor recreation have received significant critique regarding issues of representation and accessibility within a multicultural society (Francis, 1997; Loo, 2001).

Wilderness idol: overly taken with the Canadian type.

The "Canadian" experience of the landscape has been based on the mythology of the explorer and courier de bois, among others (Potter & Henderson, 2001). As Francis (1997) and Cameron (1999) show, the myths about Tom Thomson and his artwork have come to exemplify, in the image of the *coureur-de-bois* and frontiersman, a variety of persistent tropes of Canadian-ness. According to Francis (1997) and Cameron (1999) the "myth of Thomson" characterises the painter as the "Canadian type": A person who has an affinity with the primitive, is a highly skilled canoeist and backwoodsman, as well as an untutored genius with a lover's intimate knowledge of the wilderness. Above all,

Cameron suggests, the myth paints Thomson and the Canadian type as living with the spirit of the North. Thomson might be said to represent the Canadian *wilderness idol.* Cameron argues that Thomson took up a role in Canadian society similar to Whitman or Thoreau in the United States. While many current outdoor guides and recreation practitioners might not be familiar with Thomson, both Cameron and Francis argue that this myth has had a lasting effect on the meaning of wilderness, national identity, and outdoor recreation within certain elements of Canadian society.

Different from American frontiersman identity, portrayed as overcoming the trials of the wilds, Cameron (1999) describes the Canadian type as living *in* a Canadian landscape "as had the earliest trappers and initial settlers…imbued with the imagined characteristics of Indigenous Canadians" (p. 208) and is framed in opposition to the city. Furthermore, the myth has often been perpetuated; Grey Owl, Pierre Trudeau and, more recently, Bill Mason are well-known examples (Francis, 1997). Essential to the *wilderness idol* is the *wilderness idyll*: "the wilderness man who finds escape and spiritual comfort in the simplicity of the canoe" (Francis, 1997, p.145).

The Thomson myth is exclusively male. As Cameron (1999) points out, women were routinely taken out of many aspects of the Thomson story, and trips were presented as all-male adventures. A feminine Nature was presented as Thomson's lover, and he as her faithful suitor. They shared intimate moments together until their relationship was finally consummated with his disappearance into the wilds on Canoe Lake in Algonquin Park (Cameron, 1999).

The Thomson myth plays directly into the idea of Nature objected to by the ecofeminist movement. As Cameron (1999) asserts, "Nature was highly sexualised" and

cast in "the romantic mould"(p. 205) as wild and untamed. The emphasis on manhood as the necessary organizing structure of society is set opposite the wilds of female nature (Cameron, 1999). The reliance on such an antagonistic duality is immediately problematic for ecofeminism, because it perpetuates the structures of a society and mode of thought that continue to place both women and nature in a negative role (Plumwood, 1998). Humberstone and Pedersen (2001) show how deep ecology finds entry into ORE, because it plays into longstanding myths of the transcendental wilderness experience and leaves androcentricity unchallenged. Humberstone and Pedersen argue wilderness areas constructed as natural environments "may become symbols and markers for hegemonic masculinity" (p.24). Plumwood (1998) convincingly shows that the concepts of self and identity employed in deep ecology, which Bordo (1997) links to Tom Thomson and the Group of Seven, remain consistently within the rationalist perspective. Plumwood argues that self and identity within deep ecology is construed variously as (a) indistinguishable from nature, (b) an expansion of the egoist self to include a wider set of concerns, (c) a transcendent or universal self.

According to Plumwood (1998) pitting anthropocentrism against a totalising ecocentric conception of self prevents the self from hearing or seeing one's self in the other. Ecocentrism as a proposed egalitarian alternative to a biased anthropocentrism washes over difference and does not recognise the need for an ethic of care (Plumwood, 1998). Deep ecology, according to Plumwood (1998) and Ryan (1999), tends to minimize differences between cultures and persons by stressing holism and unity. A universal perspective such as this enables ORE to use attractive rituals or ceremonies, such as sweat lodges, without attending to or honouring the unique cultural identity and context

that make ceremonies appropriate and effective as expressions of collective identity (Oles, 1995).

Yet the Canadian context of a multicultural society, it would seem, demands attention to the particulars of difference. Meyer (1994) and Oles (1995), Native Hawaiian and American respectively, lucidly argue that an Anglo-North American ontology has become the norm and is tacitly accepted, while other positions are reduced to "cultural components." Moreover, Oles argues, this assumption has the unfortunate effect of the occluding the myths and rituals that frame the identity of Western ORE researchers and practitioners in relation to nature.

The invocation of anthropocentric and ecocentric forms of identity appears to perpetuate a dichotomous separation of people from places by emphasising an isolated individual or universal perspective. Ingold (2000) argues that the global and ecocentric perspective exemplified in modern environmentalism moves human understanding of self from a position at the centre of their environment *within* nature to a peripheral perspective that limits a sense of responsibility or responsiveness to one's environment.

Landscape

The World Conservation Union (IUCN) defines wilderness as "large areas of unmodified or slightly modified land and/or sea, retaining its natural character and influence, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural condition" (Martin, 2001, p.6). This definition perpetuates a conception of wilderness as a "benchmark" of ecosystemic health and, conversely, the ills of civilisation. The notion of wilderness as acts as datum for destructive human activities, Wadland (1995) argues, is particularly important to Anglo-North American environmentalism. Prior to describing

wilderness as both a physical and psychological place, Miles (1999) strives to describe it from a non-anthropocentric perspective. This is, of course, necessarily anthropocentric. Indeed, nowhere in his opening paragraph do humans appear, except as an invisible witness of a place "where the processes of nature occur as they always have" and in which "the river of time flows steadily, regularly, predictably" (p. 321). The benchmark of wilderness can be read as externalizing humans and culture, especially Western culture from "pure" nature.

In a critique, Ryan (1999) explains that deep ecology is predicated on the ability of scientific ecology to provide an objective "real" understanding of nature. The deep ecological approach to ORE relies on an understanding that the power of the landscape to promote ecocentric self-realisation is firmly fixed in this real and non-cultural state of nature. The power of the landscape in promoting ecological self-realisation is supposedly inversely proportional to the level of human "impact" on the landscape and the technology used to facilitate an activity. The message is clear when Devall and Sessions (1985) argue that "there are no technological shortcuts to direct organic experiencing" (p. 89).

To this end, the practice of deep ecology within ORE has become concerned with (a) the practice of simple, non-technological, and self-sufficient living and travel; (b) gaining direction and enjoyment by working with and in nature, not against or over it; (c) leaving no trace, and being "sportsmanlike" (Drengson, 1995; Henderson, 1997; Horwood, 1991; Humberstone & Pedersen, 2001). According to deep ecology, these skills speak to the moral worth of the activity, because they allow a participant shed

culture, directly experience the landscape, and foster ecological self-realisation (Henderson, 1997; Horwood, 1991).

Thapa and Graefe (2003), as well as Haluza-Delay (1999), note that OR activities that occur "in nature" are often assumed to increase the environmental concern and awareness of participants. However, the authors continue, studies show mixed support for this association. Thapa and Graefe studied the pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours of visitors who were partaking in appreciative, consumptive, and motorized outdoor recreation activities within a State Forest. The authors found that pro-environmental orientations were strongest in those engaged in appreciative activities (cross-country skiing, canoeing, hiking) as compared to consumptive (fishing or hunting) or motorized (riding snowmobile, motor boating), while actions and intentions to publicly promote ecological conservation were highest among consumptive recreationalists. While Thapa and Graefe's study supports further exploration of the connection between outdoor recreation and changes in environmental behaviour and attitude, it also indicates a complex relationship between participants' lifestyle, technology, and their environmental attitudes and behaviours. Based on these findings, it seems reasonable to conclude that socio-environmental value and behaviour changes do not result from direct contact with nature as a pure landscape, but are mediated and influenced by complex interrelations of culture, technology, personal histories, and lifestyle.

Beyond personal history, the history of a place also influences the attitudes and behaviours of participants. Values and cultural norms can be learnt, reinforced, and mediated through park and recreation resource management (Dustin & McAvoy, 1987; Dustin et al., 1991; Dustin, Schneider, McAvoy, & Frakt, 2002; Henderson, 1990). In

order to show how the meanings of landscapes and recreation experiences are mediated, Wilson (1991) explores how the tourism and recreation industry creates and perpetuates myths. As Wilson describes, cultural myths, ideologies, meanings and narratives about the land are taken up by the tourism and recreation industry, which redefines and re-values the land in terms of participants' recreation experiences. These popular myths, and their use in tourism and recreation, also influence environmental protection, norms of suitable behaviour, and access to the land, therefore shaping recreation opportunities and experiences (Wilson, 1991). As Loo (2001) explains, "the techniques of conservation and management created a modern wilderness that, despite natural appearance, was very much a cultural artifact, one that permitted only a narrow range of uses and human relationships to it, to the exclusion of others" (p. 94-95).

Consequently, the management and marketing of land influences how, and by whom, the land is experienced. According to Martin (2001) the IUCN management strategies for wilderness areas include provisions for allowing Indigenous communities to continue living on the land so long as they remain at a low density and "in balance" with available resources. Who is going to determine, enforce, and suffer the consequences of such a "balance" in these wilderness areas? Better than forcibly removing peoples from their land—a practice that accompanied the *creation* of many wilderness areas (Loo, 2001)—these management strategies still betray the assumed distinction between humans and nature (the first great divide), and the distinction between Western industrialised culture and Indigenous cultures (the second great divide) that gives rise to issues of hegemony and colonialism. Moreover, according to Ingold (2000) the dominance of this global perspective, the idea that humans are to manage the environment from the

periphery, "leads to the systematic disempowerment of local communities, taking away from them—in the name of preserving biodiversity—the responsibility to care for their own environments" (p. 155).

To show how differing ontological understandings about the connections of culture and land continue to create conflict over recreation use and land management in contested areas McAvoy et al. (2003) explore Nuu-chah-nulth peoples' attachment to park lands in British Columbia. McAvoy (2002) and McAvoy et al. show how the dominant idea of parks as pristine areas of nature set aside from human impact contrasts with how First Nations integrate the land into their life-style, values, behaviours, and identity to creating a "thick" sense of place. Recognising the interconnection of identity and landscape, McAvoy et al. emphasize how First Nations' land reclamation and management as well as cultural agency and self-government are wrapped together in land use and place politics.

Wilderness ideal: reduction of cultural and ecological diversity.

Loo (2001) shows how the *wilderness ideal* was commercially constructed in response to middle-class anti-modernism throughout the 1930's and 40's in Canada. Leopold's scientific management strategies were used to make Canada into a modern "sportsman's paradise" thereby shaping, to a great extent, the use and popular perception of the landscape. Bordo (1992-1993), Jessup (2002), and Loo have all shown that the symbolic *wilderness ideal* gives rise to and perpetuates a conception of the wilderness park as "pristine nature" that is then (re)created, thereby giving the symbol a form, each supporting the reality of the other. Yet the concept of an ideal wilderness as utterly non-human seems to have promoted a blindness to or justification of the needed skills and

actions, some traumatic to rural and Indigenous persons, employed in the creation of wilderness.

Examining myths within Anglo-Canadian culture can help show the effects of the great divides in the treatment of First Nations. The sublime wilderness expressed within the Group of Seven's work, according to Bordo (1997, 1992-1993), heavily promotes the erasure of people from the land. Especially notable, according to Bordo (1997, 1992-1993), is the lack of the Aboriginal presence in Tom Thomson's *The Jack Pine* perhaps *the* definitive Anglo-Canadian artwork. Bordo describes the "aestheticizing or subliming of *terra nullius*" (p. 13) as the dominant cultural imperialist project of Anglo-North Americans. Bordo (1997) traces this project through the first colonists in Massachusetts Bay to the American Transcendentalists of the nineteenth century, followed by Tom Thomson and the Group of Seven, and closing the twentieth century with deep ecology. Bordo (1997) claims that Tom Thomson's and the Group of Seven's depiction of the wilderness ideal "coincides exactly with a popular view of wilderness as a physical expanse, usually of land in an ecologically pristine condition, devoid of human presence…the visual moment where the fifth day of creation converges with deep ecology" (p. 15-18).

Deep ecology and the Canadian wilderness ideal parallel each other in yet another significant way: they have both been strongly criticized for projecting a supposedly unproblematic conception of wilderness from a small elite class of citizen onto a larger population without due care for local realities. As Cameron (1999) and Jessup (2002) illustrate, the Group of Seven portrayed a small region of Ontario that was only visited by a select group as a site of recreation and leisure. The region became held as the

quintessential national environment in a country made up of diverse peoples. According to Cameron and Jessup, the nationalist vision of a non-working, uninhabited, pristine landscape as wilderness never fully connected to the diverse peoples and places of Canada. The same is said of deep ecology on a global scale; as Guha (1998) explains: "wildlands preservation has been identified with environmentalism by the state and conservation elite; in consequence, environmental problems that impinge far more directly on the lives of the poor…have not been adequately addressed" (p. 517). The deep ecology movement has forwarded the idea of wilderness as the quintessential healthy ecological system despite a world of diverse ontological positions and lifestyles. The globalising of the *wilderness ideal*, an ideal that promotes erasure of culture by ignoring the essential relationship between people, meaning, and place has had a profound effect on how deep ecological outdoor recreation understands and interacts with culture. Can practitioners really expect to have success in multi-cultural settings if they continue to rely on the wilderness ideal?

Even the dominant "Canadian" experience tells a story of co-influence and blurred distinction between nature and culture. The First Nations and the wilderness areas from which they were evicted remain on the land; they resist Thomson's and deep ecology's best attempts to mythicize and burry them in archaic time (Bordo, 1992-1993). The wilderness ideal remains an anachronism of social forces from the 1920's and 30's, immobile by definition and weak in its ability to address Canada's current socio-environmental reality. Outdoor recreation combined with deep ecology, despite its rhetoric to the contrary, makes the *wilderness idle*. The concept of *terra nullius* can be ruinous for rural peoples, especially the First Nations. Moreover, removing human

livelihood from a landscape does not necessarily equate to a more diverse or productive environment.

Take, for example, the case of Jasper National Park (JNP). Rhemtulla, Hall, Higgs, and Macdonald (2002) show that changes in vegetation cover and reductions in habitat diversity in JNP have largely resulted since the turn of the century from fire management policies and the removal of First Nations from the land. Rhemtulla et al. conclude that in the case of JNP a lower human presence and decreased fire disturbance on the landscape has lead to a "decline in diversity at multiple scales" (p. 2018). In essence, the imposition of a management regime intended to "preserve" wilderness, along with, and through, the removal of a cultural presence within the landscape has lead to an ecosystem that is "less natural," provides less diverse wildlife habitat, and is more susceptible to catastrophic fire and insect infestation.

In summary, much of ORE literature continues to rely on wilderness as a kind of place, a benchmark of real nature. The modern conception of real wilderness sets the tone in deep ecology for human relations to this pre-established place. Striving to "directly experience" a place pregnant with the potential for ecological self-realisation, deep ecological ORE favours simple, non-technological, activities and skills. The dominant ontology involved seems to conceive the person-place connection as dependent on the type of landscape (as wilderness). Landscape, from this perspective, is covered over by culture (as a purely human creation abstracted from the environment) that, when removed, reveals an experience of real nature. This does not prevent people from having meaningful and powerful experiences of places. Indeed, the concept of a "direct experience" of nature most likely enhances or facilitates experiences of the sublime or

wild. Many ORE participants celebrate and enjoy in the nature-culture dichotomy and rely on wilderness as an escape from city life. Moreover, this has led to significant "wilderness area" protection.

Despite successes using the dominant perspective, relating pro-environmental intentions and/or behaviours to ORE has been shown to be more complex than the "simple setting" approach. Learning environmental responsibility depends on the participant's activity, skills, and use of technology as well as personal history, local resource consumption/extraction, and salient myth. The experience of landscape, the learning that takes place, and politics that play out are largely mediated by management strategies and the way activities are culturally framed and communicated. The Anglo-Canadian myth of ideal wilderness has been perpetuated within the outdoor recreation industry, catering to a largely Anglo-North American population seeking experiences of the sublime. Management strategies, marketing, and programs that perpetuate these myths often do so with the best of intentions and have positive results for clients. While all thought must proceed from a set of assumptions, failing to critically examine Anglo-North American myths, as a dominant force in society, means remaining unaware of how they implicate and affect other populations, or even that alternative approaches to conservation and conceptions of landscape exist.

The wilderness ideal has relied on and spurred management strategies, at least in the case of JNP, that divorced people from their homes and weakened both cultural and natural heterogeneity. Further, this conception of wilderness may reinforce an ideology of conservation that apprehends the environment from the periphery and may reduce the ability and/or willingness of some people to care for their environment in ways that allow

for deep expression and development of identity and attachment to place. Conflicts between the First Nations and outdoor enthusiasts, park management, and policy writers have resulted from groups operating from very different ontological perspectives. Yet these "side effects" are not often accounted for in the dominant conception of landscape. Critical examination of the dominant conception of landscape and exploring alternatives might prove useful in allowing greater understanding, discussion, and ethics while working or learning in a multi-cultural context.

Thus, adopting the dominant approach to landscape without careful critical self-reflection may prove counter-productive for ORE in teaching forms of knowledge that intimately connect people to places so as to foster environmentally responsible lifestyle. Ingold (2000) may help Western and non-Western ORE students, practitioners, and researchers to critically reflect and refigure dominant conceptions of landscape while also helping Westerners to better understand the Indigenous perspective. In dwelling, connections with place are not understood as latent, but rather as the ever-changing result of a creative process of interaction between a person and their environment that result in the shifting forms of culture and landscape (Ingold, 2000).

Wilderness and Sense of Place

This section argues that the dominant conceptions of the individual and landscape, which reflect the nature-culture dichotomy (Beringer, 2004), have resulted in a reliance within ORE on (anti)modernism (Hull, 2000). Without the concepts and language necessary for overcoming the dichotomy, ORE describes an (anti)modern perspective and is left struggling to understand a hybrid of nature and culture. While the majority of research within ORE on sense of place remains divided along the nature-culture

dichotomy, a few notable studies have begun to blur the lines. Within this section I am concerned with the relation of sense of place and place construction to ideas of wilderness. I begin by examining the wilderness experience as a particular sense of place within ORE generally, and more specifically within the Canadian context as the North. I then move to show how this presents an (anti)modern perspective that has begun to be challenged by a few authors (Fishwick & Vining, 1992; McAvoy et al., 2003; Raffan, 1991; Walker & Chapman, 2003) that provide an opening for Ingold's (2000) work.

Stokowski (2002) cited the typical definition of sense of place as "an individual's ability to develop feelings of attachment to particular settings based on combinations of use, attentiveness, and emotion" (p. 368). The body of literature on sense of place focuses on the social creation of meaningful places as well as the impacts that the landscape has on humans (Stokowski, 2002). The work on how sense of place is formed tends to fall into three camps. The first two seem to follow the divisions of the nature-culture dichotomy. Some authors (Kaltenborn, 1997; Williams & Harvey, 2001) treat sense of place as a commodity largely inherent in the attributes of a site to which individuals are emotionally attracted and attached. While others (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000; Stokowski, 2002; Tuan, 1991) take the approach that sense of place is constructed through language and personal experience, the application of which serves as a political tool for self-expression and identity. Still others (Fishwick & Vining, 1992; McAvoy et al., 2003; Raffan, 1991; Walker & Chapman, 2003), I believe, open a space for Ingold's (2002) work by exploring place, and various levels of attachment to it, as resulting from interactions that give rise to cultural meaning and values within a person's environment over time.

In a study of American wilderness users' moment-to-moment subjective experience of interacting with their recreation environment, Borrie and Roggenbuck (1996) found evidence of six facets to what they call an authentic wilderness experience inspired by the writings of Thoreau, Muir, and Olsen. Borrie and Roggenbuck claim that such an experience produces an understanding of humility, oneness, and care while incorporating feelings of primitiveness, timelessness, and solitude. These qualities are anecdotally supported other authors (McAvoy & Dustin, 1989; McDonald & Schreyer, 1991; Harper, 1995). Importantly, Borrie and Roggenbuck (1996) equate these qualities with the essence and fullness of experiencing the "meaning and value of wilderness" (p. 43), and I therefore take them to be an expression of a sense of place.

Borrie and Roggenbuck (1996) are attentive to the possibility that style and practice of activities might lead to or hinder experiencing wilderness as a place. In discussion, however, the authors seem to locate these qualities in wilderness itself and exclude them from other settings such as classrooms (which they have not examined). Furthermore, the qualities of experience are dissociated from the activities of participants. Borrie and Roggenbuck propose shifting student attention away from activities and *onto* feelings of harmony and humility. They continue by arguing that instructors ought to reinforce and provide opportunity for the lessons of wilderness to *reach* their students so that instructors can engage learners in authentic experience of wilderness (Borrie & Roggenbuck, 1996).

The transcendent experience has generally been connected with social good. Authors (Borrie & Roggenbuck, 1996; Harper, 1995; Henderson, 1987; Henderson, 1989; McAvoy and Dustin, 1989) justify ORE socio-environmentally as providing a deep-

rooted, vital, human need by connecting humans with an ancient rhythm and directing participants towards a transcendent experience. Dustin et al. (1991) employ Leopold's land ethic to argue that "recreation rightly understood is a matter of virtuous conduct" (p. 99) essential to higher human fulfillment and inseparable from respect for the intrinsic value within the larger community of life. Virtuous conduct in outdoor recreation, according to Dustin et al, is marked by "ethical extensions outward from ourselves to other people, to the land and its creatures" (p.105). The authors state clearly state that "[recreation management] ought to embrace as its fundamental charge the enhancement of recreationists' moral development" (p. 102).

Transcendence within a wilderness experience is conceived in different ways. Within deep ecological ORE, transcendence is seen as a departure from normal life, a shedding of culture and attaining spiritual connections with all life, a sense of oneness that helps individuals "understand their value and responsibility in the world"(Henderson, 1990, pp. 63-64). From an American perspective, McAvoy and Dustin (1989) argue that the wilderness-as-frontier, both physical and psychological, allows individuals to transcend a "technological, urbanized and regulated world," develop greater self-knowledge and moral development and "return to civilization to integrate their newfound enlightenment into their daily lives and to share it with others"(p. 42).

Primitiveness, considered a point of social evolution "close to nature" prior to European contact or similar to the rugged frontier or voyageur life, is said to lead to moral development, self knowledge, national identity, and personal character (Borrie & Roggenbuck, 1996; Harper, 1995; McAvoy & Dustin, 1989; Miles, 1999; Pohl, Borrie, & Patterson, 2000; Potter & Henderson, 2001). According to Borrie and Roggenbuck "a

simpler way of life awaits those who leave civilization behind, and set forth into the wilderness. Beyond the constraints and responsibilities of society lies the freedom to be wild, perhaps more in tune with ancient rhythms of life" (p. 36).

Wilderness idyll: myths of the canoe and the North.

National identity forms an important component of ORE in Canada that locates the individual's identity within a cultural, historical, and political context and, therefore, relates identity with sense of place. The mythology of the canoe as *the* vehicle for connecting with the Canadian landscape, the North, is crucial to understanding Canadian wilderness recreation and national identity (Francis, 1997). Seen as simple to use, accessible to all, and providing healthy adventure, it supposedly links Canadians to a past time, a simple life, an unchanged and distinctly Canadian landscape (Francis, 1997). The canoe reigns supreme as *the* human-made symbol of each Canadian's place in a pristine landscape. According to Francis the canoe, unlocking a spiritual connection to the land while harmonizing the human and the wild, is the Canadian cipher to the paradox of the wilderness. The canoe might be considered Canada's *wilderness idyll.*

As Francis (1997) explains, short canoe trips remain a common way for Canadians to get back to nature. Described as "spiritual pilgrimages," "rest-cures," and "the perfect machine," canoeing and canoes are heavily laden with the myth (Francis, 1997). Francis concludes that the Canadian myth of the canoe appears in four main ways: (a) The idea of canoeing as "good medicine for whatever ails you"; (b) the canoe trip as an encounter with history; (c) canoeing as "a discovery of national identity"; and (d) the canoe trip as "a spiritual quest" (p.149-151). Of course, Francis cautions, this ideology of the canoe remains the purview of a select and privileged portion of the Canadian

population. Both the canoe as a mode of travel and the North as a mythic landscape supposedly frame "Canadian" identity.

MacLaren (1999) argues that wilderness areas such as JNP are the supposed defining places of the True North and have been managed in an effort to "preserve" "pristine" collections of species and places in which we go to "feel Canadian". Many Canadian citizens claim that landscapes such as JNP have a defining influence on individual and collective identity (MacLaren, 1999). Wadland (1995) observes that "… although modern Canadians tend to consider wilderness and culture antithetical notions, as consumers they unite in identifying both with their leisure time—with their recreation" (p. 12). According to Wadland, what Canadians have chosen to call their culture is essentially wilderness.

Potter and Henderson (2001) describe the Canadian landscape as "a space that outdoor adventure educators yearn to make our 'place', a setting in which [outdoor educators and participants] seek identity" (p.7). In describing a "Canadian" sense of place Potter and Henderson focus on the North, "an authentic and wilder place with a history of travel and lifestyle to be reclaimed, even is for fleeting moments" (p. 3). They argue that landscape, for the majority of Canadians living in urban areas, is a space (vast and unknown) that holds the qualities of the "Near North," "North" or "Far North" as varying degrees of "wildness" depending on where one lives and the extent of experience on the land (Potter & Henderson, 2001). Echoing both the myth of the wilderness ideal and socio-economic reality of the country, Potter and Henderson argue that a "duality of northern wild and southern 'civilized'" (p. 6) marks Canadian identity. Outdoor educators, they note, make particular and hopefully appropriate use of "travel heritage,

pioneer lifestyle and Indigenous peoples' material culture and spiritual view…storytelling, craft and skill" (p. 6) in order to explore a richly lived, explored, and storied landscape. The expansive geography of Canada has long been a storied landscape supplying national icons such as the loon, beaver, canoe and voyageur. Unfortunately, Potter and Henderson state, increasing urbanisation has transformed the *place* of the bush into a *space* of wilderness, empty of stories.

The very stories that make up Canadian national identity that Potter and Henderson (2001) appeal to in their writings have been challenged by Bordo (1992-93, 1997), Loo (2001), Francis (1997), Jessup (2002), and Cameron (1999) as examples of the myth making efforts by the tourism and recreation industry and/or invoked within a nationalistic fervour by an Anglo-Canadian elite. As Cameron (1999) argues, these tropes were only relevant to or celebrated in a "metropolitan Anglo-Canadian nationalist intelligentsia" (p. 208) as the antithesis of the city, but still accessible through summer trips to Algonquin or Muskoka. Many of Thomson's boosters and critics alike, Cameron shows, have described and portrayed his experiences in Algonquin as though they were common and familiar experiences to all Canadians. In Thomson's paintings of the wild his promoters saw a portrayal of the emotional essence of the "Canadian" experience and relationship to wilderness. Essentially, Cameron argues that Thomson's paintings, personality, and experiences were used to define a normative and nationalistic identity through a sense of place. Further, Cameron shows how this sense of place, as the antithesis to the city, was predicated upon the strictly (anti)modern sentiment of the day. This (anti)modernism, however, was portrayed not as a challenge the propriety of "civilised" urban social life, but as a reaffirmation of the virility and intimate relationship

middle-class Torontonians supposedly had with the wilds of northern Ontario. As I have shown, the understanding of landscape perpetuated by these myths have led to social injustices related to land management, the exclusion of particular groups' voice from national identity formation, as well as cultural misrepresentations of various regions and peoples (Bordo, 1992-93, 1997; Loo 2001; Francis, 1997; Jessup 2002). This is not to say that the myths are necessarily detrimental. Indeed, they continue to provide rich meaning for many Canadians. From a professional perspective these myths must be critically evaluated and employed with knowledge of the work they do, the sense of place they invoke, and the conceptions of identity and landscape they perpetuate.

Showing critical concern for the nature-culture dichotomy, Duenkel and Scott (as cited in Potter and Henderson, 2001), argue that adventure education in Canada is less about transfer of learning from wilderness to civilisation and more a visceral, experiencing *with* the land (as an ever present force in the "Canadian experience") that forces participants to question their relationship with the land, the mythic duality of humanity and nature, and their place in the "greater scheme of things." Potter and Henderson argue for understanding the Canadian landscape as the "country way back in," not a *terra nullius*, but a lived in and worked in, yet distant, and powerful landscape. The authors lament the loss of stories and personal experiences that define the "Canadian" identity. Carefully qualifying their generalizations, the authors nonetheless use the persistent myths of the *Canadian type* and *the North* to define as well as give meaning and purpose to a "Canadian" form of adventure education. Essentially, Potter and Henderson argue that Canadian ORE allows participants to live those mythic experiences that have defined Canadian identity but elude the predominantly city-bound citizenry.

(Anti)modernism

Meyers (2001) describes (anti)modernism as a move towards an intense form of physical and spiritual experience, often associated with primitiveness, in reaction to an overly civilized modern experience. Adherents to (anti)modernism are disenchanted with the "progress" of Western culture, which they see as morally and ecologically bankrupt (Altmeyer, 1995; Latour, 1992/1993). (Anti)modernism seeks to fight this bankruptcy and revolutionize Western culture by rejecting decadence and technology through a return to nature, a more primitive, or "premodern," social order—the romantic "simple life" (Altmeyer, 1995; Anderson, 2001; Cronon, 1996; Hull, 2000; Jasen, 1995). Indeed, primitivism, according to Borrie and Roggenbuck (1996) is a defining characteristic of the authentic wilderness experience. I use *(anti)modernism* to indicate that this perspective, while emphasising different values, does not challenge the dominant categories of modernity.

Hull (2000) levels sharp critique against dominant, romantic views that "celebrate untrammelled nature as a holy temple, where one finds God, learns moral lessons, and retreats from civilisation" (p. 54). Hull believes that the romantic view of nature is largely based on a rather narrow reading that remains blind to activate participation in landscapes of Thoreau, Muir, and Emerson. The understanding of wilderness as a benchmark for social and ecological (de)gradation has become institutionalized in practices such as Leave No Trace camping. This, according to Hull, polarizes humans and nature by reinforcing the idea that human impact has no place in a nature that can, and should, be pristine. Moreover, the idea that nature can be pristine, and that it is somehow better as such, has been shown to be misguided both from ecological and philosophical points of

view (Hull, 2000). Romantic ideals focus on the past and obfuscate the development of a healthy *lived-with* environment (Hull, 2000). Hull calls for humans to build respect and admiration not just for nature, but for our *relationship* with nature, and not just wild nature, but all forms as "a dance and celebration rather than as rape and degradation" (p. 55).

As Latour (1992/1993) explains, (anti)modernism takes modernism at "face value" – it accepts and relies on the split of nature and culture that modernism has established. According to the modern project, pristine wilderness as the epitome of objective nature, and society as the archetype of subjective culture, are by definition separate. From an (anti)modern perspective wilderness acts as a counterpart to Descartes' solitary knowing subject, functioning as a "clean slate" necessary for "true" knowledge and direct philosophical/spiritual understanding of the "demise" of society (Bordo, 1997). (Anti)modernism rearranges the values placed on nature and culture but does not question their validity. (Anti)modernism, as Anderson (2001) describes, is essentially the dark-side of the moon that is modernity. Ingold (2000) argues that many critical reactions to dominant Western epistemology tend not to challenge the paradigmatic assumptions of inherent to modernity.

Moreover, (anti)modernism is at odds with some views of current social reality, and so, some argue, can only hold an anachronistic and pessimistic voice (Hull, 2000; Latour, 1992/1993). "In search for solutions to contemporary problems," Hull (2000) states, "the Romantic ethic forces us to look backwards towards the past for guides rather than forward towards future possibilities" (p. 55). By supposedly stepping outside of society, ORE participants celebrate a nature in which humans have no place or role.

Because the concepts of nature and society are kept distinct—even while the aim is to draw them together—both deep ecology and the land ethic degrade into comparisons of the relative worth of society or nature that lead to misanthropy and discussions of anthropocentrism versus ecocentrism (Lo, 2001; Ferry, 1992/1995). Moreover, the (anti)modern bent of ORE continues to support and rely on the two great divides, an ontological position that creates "blind spots" in understanding environmental justice and ethical action.

Scholars are struggling within the confines of the nature-culture dichotomy to describe the processes and practices of ORE experiences that inherently blur these boundaries. The wilderness-city dichotomy used in many programs has provided benefits and inspired environmental values and behaviours in participants (Pohl, Borrie, & Patterson, 2000). Seeking further and more immediate changes in participant lifestyle, Haluza-Delay (1999) argues that keeping society and nature conceptually and ideologically distinct has lead to inconsistent if not hypocritical ORE programming when practitioners have attempted to integrate or transfer learning to urban environments. Struggling to improve upon and better measure the gains made by ORE in achieving an impact on Western society, authors (Haluza-Delay, 1999; Henderson, 1990; Kivel, 2000; Priest & Gass, 1997; Roberts & Rodriguez, 1999; Sasidharan, 2002) concede that practices, curricula, and management with a tangible effect on environmental sustainability beyond wilderness use and creation remain illusive.

Away from (anti)modernism: sense of place literature.

Attempts to connect people with nature have, despite the assumed dichotomy, opened ways to examining sense of place, identity, culture, and experience as fostering

environmental values, intentions, and behaviours in participants (Walker & Chapman, 2003; Walker & Fox, 2000). A significant body of literature has called for research examining how broad factors (such as culture, skills, recreation, and life experience) as well as situational factors (such as leadership style, program content, and group norms) lead to various senses of place and environmental values (Dustin et al., 2002; Fishwick & Vining, 1992; Fox, 2000; Jessup, 2002; Loo, 2001; McAvoy et al., 2003; Walker & Chapman, 2003; Walker & Fox, 2000).

As a way of moving beyond (anti)modernism, I wish to focus on studies of sense of place within ORE that have begun to blur the dichotomy of nature and culture. Writing on sense of place that integrates the social construction and the physical landscape is often directed towards or in response to land management issues (Dustin et al., 2002; McAvoy et al., 2003; Walker & Chapman, 2003). Processes that mix culture and nature confront those researchers inclined to shift focus from an individual's *sense* of place to the *development* of places. Such a shift in focus brings forth processes that infuse the natural world with cultural meaning while providing the physical structure and objects that support human society and culture. Ingold (2000) is one author of many who addresses the nature of places, their construction, and their role in enmeshing human society with the natural world. The studies below provide entry for Ingold into ORE.

The fact that sense of place plays an important role in land management speaks to the influence of differing ontological positions on environmental values and behaviours. Cross-cultural conflict is likely to occur as a result of different senses of a particular place (Dustin et al., 2002; McAvoy et al., 2003; Walker & Chapman, 2003). The plurality of Canadian society has lead to many such place-based conflicts, especially over places

considered suitable for wilderness protection, recreation services, and/or cultural heritage (Bordo, 1997; Jessup, 2002; Loo, 2001; McAvoy et al., 2003). The Oka Crisis, the creation of Pacific Rim National Park Reserve, and logging in and around Clayuquot Sound are only three highly publicized examples.

McAvoy's (2002, 2003; Dustin, Schneider, McAvoy & Frakt, 2002) work, in general, points towards sense of place as the nexus of the dialogue between land management practices and participants' identity-forming recreational experiences that shape and are shaped by larger cultural meanings of landscape. Moving beyond "thin" attachment to place as an emotional response to a physical setting, McAvoy et al. (2003) trace and try to account for historical, political, traditional experiences in their examination of the conflict over land management involving Parks Canada and the Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations of Clayuquot Sound, British Columbia. The authors recognize the influence of place-meanings on life-style, environment, and quality of life. Regarding First Nations' struggle to retain land use rights in protected areas, McAvoy et al. state that "these activities are of high importance to Indian people in their efforts to live out the place meanings they hold for certain lands" (p. 101). Whether the authors grasp the importance of subsistence use in *producing* and *maintaining* the place meanings that they say the Nuu-chah-nulth hold is unclear. This study does, however, clearly address the reality of different ontological positions and the kinds of knowledge and identity each allows for in relation to place. Furthermore, future case studies on contested terrain may benefit from Ingold's (2000) description of Indigenous livelihood and "resource management."

Walker and Chapman (2003) observe that research on how sense of place develops is lacking. Importantly, the authors suggest the development of interpretive programs to accentuate the development of visitor's sense of place. Walker and Fox (2000) mention the effects of recreation guides on participants' sense of place. Furthermore, Walker and Chapman point out the possible influence of interpretation programs on sense of place and, potentially, pro-environmental intentions as well as behaviours. These studies, contrary to the majority of work within ORE, have begun to suggest the socio-environmental malleability of sense of place in relation to particular wilderness and ORE settings.

Stokowski (2002) argues that particular affiliations to place are sustained through icons, metaphors, and symbols as rhetoric and find formal structure in myths, narratives, and fables. The power of place, Stokowski argues, lies not only in aesthetic or behavioural possibilities but also in its ability to connect people within society so as to create personal and communal identities. Both Tuan (1991) and Stokowski emphasize how the moral dimension of place making and unmaking through a dialogic process of living in an environment blurs the distinctions between self and place. Thus, narrative, myths, and stories hold power by creating the meanings attached to places. Citing Cresswell, Stowkowski explains that places form a "normative landscape" (p. 374) that dictates appropriate behaviours and values. Thus efforts to create or perpetuate a particular sense of place, such as Borrie and Roggenbuck's (1996) analysis of the authentic wilderness experience, become an elaboration of the "beliefs and values of some collection of people, expressed and fostered in their promotion of a preferred reality" (Stokowski, 2002, p. 374). Echoing my own position, this implies that sharing

places requires obligations towards those places and the individual's connected to them, and thus speaks to socio-environmentally responsible values and behaviours.

According to Raffan (1991), there has been a conspicuous lack of experience-based research on sense of place. He calls for research to cross over from theories of human geography into ethnography and cultural anthropology, as an approach and discipline capable of capturing a holistic understanding of participant sense of place. Raffan uses the terms experiential (having had personal experience), toponymic (having to do with place names), narrative (various stories, myths, gossip), and numinous (deeply emotional, spiritual, moving connections) as various components of sense of place that co-mingle. Such a framework, Raffan insists, can indicate the depth and quality of place attachment within a participant's daily life. The extent to which people define themselves in terms of the land and are willing to vehemently act for its protection depends, according to Raffan, upon the activities they are involved with, the time spent within a place, and the person's dependence on the land for the necessities of life.

Fishwick and Vining (1992) conducted a phenomenological study of factors leading to participant's choice of recreation setting. They demonstrate that the development of sense of place goes beyond setting to involve a complex mixture of "landscape, ritual, routine, people, personal experience, and within the context of other places" (p. 61) as an expression of the participant's life-world. Significantly, according to Fishwick and Vining feelings of belonging within a setting, either natural or built, depend on past experience with similar places. Wilderness settings, they found, lead to a sense of alienation from the natural environment as often as feelings of being at one with nature. The same was true for feeling "at home" in human-build environments; those with

experience in pristine settings found built environments stifling, while others found them comforting. The authors suggest further study regarding the effects of experience on environmental perception. Understanding how experience influences environmental perception, values, and choices has implications for achieving the goal of creating place attachment that fosters socio-environmentally responsible behaviour.

Despite Fishwick and Vining's (1992) findings, sense of place is almost without fail expressed as a positive emotion or state of being. Based on works of Cuthbertson, Heine, and Whitson (1996) and Beringer (1990), Haluza-Delay (1999) argues that an individual's self-understanding is based on a sense of place that encompasses their location, social scheme, and connections with particular places and individuals. Haluza-Delay (1999) concludes that outdoor programming, with its success in developing care for self and others, is ideally suited to help participants develop a "compassionate sense of place." In a similar vein, Walker and Chapman (2003) highlight the role of empathy and perspective taking within a conceptual framework that describes how sense of place can affect the pro-environmental intentions of participants.

These few research projects represent an important turn that recognizes the co-influence and responsiveness of social and environmental factors away from the nature-culture dichotomy within place research associated with ORE. If, as Ewert (1996), Haluza-Delay (1999), and Sasidharan (2002) suggest, ORE is especially suited to the study, understanding, and education of people in relation with landscapes, literature on sense of place is beginning to show aspects of ORE in which nature and culture are difficult to decipher and define. Understanding how sense of place develops within ORE may require an approach that can "take in the big picture" without assuming distinctions

between or giving priority to the physical attributes or social constructions of a place. Such *a priori* distinctions in the examination of place may reduce the vitality and/or accuracy with which research and theory represents lived experiences that lead to senses of place. Importantly, a movement away from (anti)modernism begins to be seen in an understanding of sense of place that accounts for both the cultural and natural factors and their interaction in the development of sense of place. Such a conceptualisation can be seen in Walker and Chapman's (2003) attention to the processes involved in the formation of sense of place; Stokowski's (2002) exploration of the relationship between story, myth, politics, and place; Fishwick and Vining's (1992) concept of a network of places; Raffan's (1991) emphasis on daily activity and nurturing interactions; Haluza-Delay's (1999) incorporation of ethical concerns; and finally Dustin et al. (2002) as well as McAvoy et al. (2003) ability to accommodate various ontological positions as they manifest in land use and management. Yet a discursive model of place development, based on an anthropological approach such as Ingold's (2000), incorporating both physical and social reality remains under developed within ORE. The following section represents a small next step in the development of a heuristic framework. Ingold posits "the first step" (p. 60) towards a truly ecological anthropology requires the researcher to deal with human-environment relations. To move in this direction, Ingold argues,

> would be to recognise that these relations… are not confined to a domain of 'nature,' separate from, and given independently of, the domain in which [humans] lead their lives as persons. For hunter-gatherers as for the rest of us, life is given in engagement, not in disengagement, and in that very engagement the

> real world at once ceases to be 'nature' and is revealed to us as an environment for people. (p. 60)

In the section that follows I describe some of Ingold's (2000) perspective on conceptions of landscape, identity, and sense of place as they relate to skill development and practice within ORE.

Chapter Three: Weaving Landscape, Identity, and Sense of Place Through Skill

The relationships between landscape, skill, identity, and sense of place that I am trying to describe are not linear, and so there is no easy way to designate a starting point. I begin with and work from skill because it is fundamentally important to understanding the relation between humans and landscape. Environmentally oriented skills are present in ORE: students learn travel and navigation, weather prediction, as well as interpretation of "natural" and "cultural" history. Skills hold a prominent place in ORE; yet beyond obvious pragmatics there appears to be little written on possible connections between the learning and performance of skills and changes in participant's environmental perception and values.

This lack exists, perhaps, because the (anti)modern SE ethical framework locates the ability to alter a participant through ORE in the form of the landscape, usually as wilderness, or in a non-Western culture. (Anti)modern proponents advocate simple practices that supposedly facilitate direct experience of the land with minimum impact on its vitality. I believe these practices are valuable and encourage a kind environmental awareness. Rather than focusing on skill and knowledge, however, a romantic or an (anti)modern sensibility bases the value of such practices on primitivism: a desired lack of modern technology and escape from civilisation. Preoccupied by the *formal* [9]differences between civilisation and wilderness or Western and Indigenous cultures, proponents of the (anti)modern ethic have not, to my knowledge, examined the importance of task and development of skill in the role that tools and technology play in

---

[9] "Formal" as differences in form, not as 'official' or 'recognised'.

human interactions. From the (anti)modern perspective wilderness or cities as forms appear to embody certain experiences or qualities, when in fact such experiences may depend on a human-environment relationship mediated through skill.

The main purpose of Potter and Henderson's (2001) article was certainly not to explore the issue of tools, technology, and skill in relation to sense of place and identity. Despite this, Potter and Henderson forward a common belief and reaction to the proliferation of technology within ORE. Highly relevant to the dwelling perspective, the authors hit upon an important conception within Canadian outdoor adventure education:

> Traditional Canadian bush craft skills, such as traditional forms of fire lighting, shelter building, tool making and foraging, liberate students to live in the bush for an indefinite period of time with a minimal dependence on modern materials and tools. Furthermore, such traditional skills foster a greater sense of connection and security to nature as 'home', nurture independence and encourage students to appreciate and respect Canada's rich cultural heritage. Ironically, these antiquated methods are far less expensive than current methodologies. (p. 17)

Potter and Henderson express an important distinction between traditional skills and modern technology in experiencing and developing place connections. I argue that the modern Western notions of skill and experience have limited the understanding within ORE of how tasks, skills, tools, and technology engage participants with landscape.

In order to set the stage, let us first briefly examine how the (anti)modern perspective understands this issue. I would like to place in the context of Western culture the (anti)modern fear that technology represents a co-option by society and a threat to

"direct experience" of nature, ecological self-realisation, and spirituality upon which, Capra (1995) argues, a new ecological ethic and culture could be based. This distrust of modern technology is epitomized by Devall and Sessions' (1985) statement that "there are no technological shortcuts to direct organic experiencing" (p. 89).

Given the Western conceptions of *society*, *nature*, *technology,* and *experience* why does (anti)modernism find technology threatening? Such a fear becomes understandable following an examination of how these terms are framed or conceptualized in the West. Ingold (2000) acknowledges that the dominant Western understanding of technology is embedded in a "polarity of society and nature" dominated by the "ultimate supremacy of human reason" (p. 312). From the Western perspective

> Society is considered to be the mode of association of rational beings, nature the external world of things as it appears to the reasoning subject, and technology the means by which a rational understanding of that external world is turned to account for the benefit of society. (Ingold, 2000, p. 312)

Given that the (anti)modern approach to ORE is a reaction to but remains within the dominant Western conceptual framework, seeing technology as a threat to "organic experience" for fear of having the epitome of nature—wilderness—co-opted for society's use seems justified. Yet as I have described, (anti)modernism positions humanity on the periphery of nature while celebrating primitivism, a position that plays host to a myriad of ethical dilemmas regarding social evolution. Primitivism also seems to be a rather simple response to complicated questions about what distinguishes modern from traditional skill, tools, or technology and why they have such different effects on the ability of participants to foster a sense of *home*. Moreover, a celebration of the primitive

may lead to further appropriation of Indigenous ceremonies and practices by ORE practitioners as opposed to evaluating and being creative with the tools, skills, and technologies Western practitioners already use.

Using the dwelling perspective, I argue that the distinction in ORE between traditional and modern practices should not be based on culture or evolution, but on the differences between technology, tools, and skill. Moving past primitivism and (anti)modernism, Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective may begin to provide a rationale or understanding of how and why participant experience differs when using tools, technology, and/or skills. Using technology or tools to interact with landscape must in some way improve or facilitate our experience, otherwise we would be walking naked and barefoot, eating uncooked food, and shunning a Clovis point for want of an organic experience.

What, then, is meant by *experience*. I find the notion of "direct experience" troubling. The language frames *experience* from a Western perspective and seems to assume that there is a real nature, separate from society, which *can* and *should* be experienced without the mediation of culture. Ingold (2000) carefully explores how *experience* differs between the Western conception and the perspective of the Ojibwa, who do not distinguish between nature and culture. According to Ingold, the Western conception of experience refers to those happenings that mediate between the world of nature and a world of approximate mental representations, which allow a person to generate and test ideas through perception and observation, respectively. Therefore, from a deep ecological standpoint a "direct experience" would provide a pure or clear

understanding of nature that can guide political and social action on behalf of the ecosystem, as Ryan (1999) describes.

In contrast to the Western perspective, Ingold (2000) suggests that the use of tools and pieces of technology influence formative experiences, not by providing a larger hole through the screen of culture that obstructs humanity's view of "real" nature, but by shaping human perception and therefore, conceptions of self, setting, and their interrelation. From the perspective of the Ojibwa, experiences "cannot mediate between mind and nature, since they are not separated in the first place" (Ingold, 2000, p. 99). Experiences are events or occurrences that are "intrinsic to the ongoing process of *being alive to the world*... to the generative process wherein persons—both human and other-than-human—come into being and pursue the goal of life, each within the field of relations with others" (Ingold, 2000, p. 99).[10] Experience, in this sense, does not test one's abstract concepts; it tests one's powers of perception. The conditions of truth from this perspective, Ingold explains, lie not in reconciling one's beliefs with the "real world," but rather in the authenticity and formative nature of the experience itself; in "shaping of the person's sense of self, and of the attitudes and orientations towards the world" (p. 99). Ingold concludes that, like Ojibwa life, such formative experiences are at the foundation of science and western culture. The Ojibwa show those of us in Western cultures that experiences can function as more than a conciliator between cognitive representations and a supposedly objective world. By focusing on the dwelling

[10] This conception of experience is very different from that of current experiential education that follows more along the lines of experimenting with aligning one's abstract concepts to the reality of the world. Though not addressed in this thesis, the dwelling perspective would surely have implications for experiential education. Tentatively, I would expect a focus around the ability of the educator to help the student attend to particular aspects of his or her environment. Playing off a long-standing analogue, such an education might be a matter of showing a student how to hear a mountain that speaks for itself.

perspective, Western ORE practitioners may explore how experiences actually help to formulate a sense of self and disposition to one's environment. I examine this formative type of experience in the use and development of skill within ORE.

If as ORE professionals and researchers we are trying to achieve a connection between people and places, then the relationships between skill, connection to place, and making a home is very important. An environment in which an individual is able to maintain longstanding relationships that contributes significantly to that *organism-person's* identity might be considered a milieu in which they feel "at home." Ingold (2000) connects Western and Aboriginal cultures and societies as well as current and traditional practices through the common human practice of actively creating a home environment.[11] Ingold (2000) states that:

> ...home may represent a certain perspective on the world, which I have called the perspective of *dwelling*. Its focus is on the process whereby features of the environment take on specific meanings through their incorporation into the pattern of everyday activity of its inhabitants. Home, in this sense, is that zone of familiarity which people know intimately, and in which they, too, are intimately known. (p. 330)

Being at home, then, is a process within a context and not a static state or location. Moreover, individuals deepen or change their identity by creating and maintaining new

---

[11] While the ability to create a home is common, Ingold (2000) shows that Western industrial society differs from Aboriginal and pre-industrial societies because, in some regards, the human force of production in industrial society has been abstracted from context of production and the products produced. "The transition, in the history of human technicity, from hand-tool to the machine, is not from the simple to the complex, but is rather tantamount to the withdrawal of the producer, in person, from the centre to the periphery of the productive process. It is a history... not of complexification but of externalisation" (p. 289). According to Ingold, life in modern Industrial society is marked by a back-and-forth play between the dwelling perspective, in which we create a sense of home, and coping with the constraints of the Western discourse that denies the reality of this experience.

relationships within different environments, thus, expanding their home. This occurs through formative experiences. In what follows I provide an explanation of how skill, from the dwelling perspective, mediates the building and maintaining of a home. Thus in what follows, skill acts as a thread that weaves identity and landscape into places, which may or may not be incorporated into a sense of home.

Giving *process* priority over *form*, the dwelling perspective partially locates the power to change both the environment and the individual in the skilled ways humans interact with our environment. Environmental values, meanings, and senses of place do not, according to the dwelling perspective, come about as result of something inherent in the land. Skilled interaction, as one component of Ingold's (2000) theory, mediates not only the form of persons and places but also their identity and values. Through ORE, participants learn skills that enable them to perceive certain aspects of their socio-environmental environment and accomplish tasks in a landscape. Given the participant's intended tasks, the skills required may open different meaning and significance within the landscape. Changes in skill and landscape (river conditions, topography, presence of human-built structures) may expose the environment as bewildering, hostile, familiar, calming and/or some combination of these. I have transitioned from discussing landscape as a theme to discussing skill in consort with landscape because of the importance of skill in both the perception and formation of landscape.

Collectively, the interrelations of people, things, and places that form during daily activities manifest as landscape and become meaningful within a *poetics of dwelling* (Ingold, 2000). A foundational concept in Ingold's anthropology, a *poetic of dwelling* informs a person's intuition, actions, and ontology and refers to one's sensual interaction

with and attention to their environment. Explicating what he means by a poetics of dwelling, Ingold draws mainly on Hallowell's study of Cree society in the Canadian boreal forest to show that, like Cree knowledge, scientific objectivity depends on engagement with, not detachment from, the world. Citing Anderson (2000), Ingold uses the term *sentient ecology* in describing a poetic of dwelling as a pre-objective, pre-ethical form of knowledge "based in feeling, consisting in the skills, sensitivities and orientations that have developed through long experience of conducting one's life in a particular environment" (p. 25). A poetic of dwelling informs and facilitates one's ethics, ontology, and ability—in the case of Western culture—to look at the world in an objective way. "Far from confronting one another across the boundary of nature," Ingold states of the relationship between Western and hunter-gatherer behaviour, both scientists and hunter-gatherers "are fellow passengers in this world of ours, who carry on the business of life and, in so doing, develop their capacities and aspirations, within a continuing history of involvement with both human and non-human components of their environments" (pp. 38-39). Furthermore, Ingold concludes, "if we are to develop a thoroughgoing ecological understanding of how real people relate to these environments, and of the sensitivity and skill with which they do so, it is imperative to take this condition of involvement as our point of departure" (p. 39).

I should clarify the difference between Ingold's stance and a constructivist position. Neither Ingold (2000) nor I use *poetic of dwelling* as a synonym for social construction. Social construction assumes a prior, separate, and objective nature to which humans apply symbolic meaning (that resides purely within the human mind and is

arrived at through socialization).[12] A poetic of dwelling, on the other hand, begins with immersion and the non-reparability of human society from nature. Ingold believes that "metaphors of cultural construction… have an effect quite the opposite to that intended. For the very idea that meaning *covers over* the world, layer upon layer, carries the implication that the way to uncover the most basic level of human beings' practical involvement with their environments is by stripping these layers away" (p. 208). This is precisely what the deep ecological perspective within ORE advocates participants and practitioner do. In attempting to leave Western culture behind, practitioners, participants, and researchers may be neglecting the important ways that recreation activities occur within and contribute to their culture.

To begin, I turn to the nature of skill and technological knowledge along with the use of tool and devices. In doing so, I try to show how differentiating and understanding the dynamics between skill and technological knowledge as well as tools and devices may help Western ORE practitioners draw students' attention to their environment. I draw on ORE examples and lay out some implications for research and practice regarding pedagogy, language, and place-based conflict. This leads to an exploration of the interrelationship of skill, identity and social relations.

Skilled and Technological Knowledge: The use of Tools and Devices

Skill and tools.

Ingold (2000) begins his description of technical skill by sketching the dominant Western conception. According to Plato (as cited in Ingold, 2000) skill involves the

---

[12] For example, see Greider, T. & Garkovich, L. (1994). Landscapes: the social construction of nature and the environment. *Rural Sociology*, 59 (1) pp. 1-24.

control of a subservient body by the rational human mind, the supposed true essence of humanity. Juxtaposed to this view of skill as an exclusively human affair, Ingold outlines and exemplifies five key components of technical skill by comparing and contrasting the making of string bags by the Telefol people and the nest-building of weaverbirds. By arguing that skill is neither essentially controlled by a rational mind nor entirely guided by external environmental factors, Ingold challenges and draws together the two perspectives that Wall, Reid, and Harvey (2004) show dominate the Western debate and thinking on skill.

First, Ingold (2000) argues, skill needs to be understood as a "gestural synergy" of tools, person, raw materials, and environment in which a person or animal performs of a pattern of "dextrous activity" to accomplishes a *task*. The functionality and intent of the skill are imminent in this synergy. "In this sense," Ingold states that "the hands and eyes of the [canoeist], as well as his [paddle and canoe], are not so much used as *brought into use*, through their incorporation into an accustomed (that is usual) pattern of dextrous activity" (p. 352).[13] Ingold (2000) defines *task* as "any practical operation, carried out by a skilled agent in an environment, as part of his or her normal business of life. In other words, tasks are constitutive acts of dwelling" (p. 195) to which skills are essential. A task can be intrinsically or extrinsically motivated; from the dwelling perspective the term "task" does not carry a negative connotation.

Observing that technique does not necessarily depend on tool use, Mauss (as cited in Ingold, 2000) supposes the human body to be an individual's most basic tool. In contrast to this, Ingold presents the second dimension of skill. Skill is not simply a

---

[13] Ingold uses Plato's example of a shoemaker, therefore in this quotation I have substituted the words *shoemaker* for *canoeist* and *cutting tools* for *paddle and canoe*. The remainder of the quotation is accurate.

technique practiced by an individual human body, rather skill must be understood as a property within "the total field of relations constituted by the presence of the organism-person, indissolubly body and mind, in a richly structured environment" (Ingold, 2000, p. 353). [14] Ingold uses the term organism-person to express the inseparability of personality and sense of self from the biological body and socio-environmental environment in which an individual exists. The term is intended to capture at once the human biologically, mentally, socially, and environmentally. Skill must be understood as a system that incorporates all of these realms of human reality along with the tools used and raw materials incorporated.

Third, beyond the mere application of mechanical force to an object, technical skill requires the practitioner to be involved *with* the object in order to exercise care, judgment, and dexterity (Ingold, 2000). Citing Bernstein's examination of a blacksmith, Ingold argues that the performance of skill requires continual attention and "'tuning' of movement in response to an ongoing perceptual monitoring of the emerging task" (p. 353). Examining basket weaving, Ingold shows that "every action has a narrative quality, in the sense that every movement, like every line in a story, grows rhythmically out of the one before and lays the groundwork for the next" (p. 347). Within ORE, learning to attend to this narrative quality can be troublesome for a novice trying to straight-line paddle a white water kayak. When performed by a skilled person straight-line paddling looks deceptively easy. These boats have no rudder and are designed to spin easily, so to keep a straight course the novice must learn to make minute adjustments to the force,

---

[14] An analysis based on Ingold's five components of skill might provide a new perspective on the long-standing debate regarding leadership as an innate or acquired skill. Given the ethical, conceptual, and highly social nature of leadership such an analysis would involve a very diverse field of relations, probably drawing together multiple skills of different kinds, not only technical.

positioning, and duration of each paddle stroke in response to the last. Coordinating alternating strokes based on "the feel" of the boat, the river's current, and the wind—not to mention oncoming obstacles—takes a great deal of time, practice, and attention.

Returning to the weaving of string bags by the Telefol people, Ingold (2000) shows that technical skills are learned and passed on, not through the transmission of formulae, but through "introducing novices to contexts which afford selected opportunities for perception and action" (Ingold, 2000, p. 354). Through guidance and mentorship, a novice learns to fine-tune his or her movements in accordance with his or her tools and environment. Based on a study of weaverbirds by Collias and Collias (as cited in Ingold, 2000), Ingold describes how the dexterity of movement, as a function of skill, is "developmentally incorporated into the *modus operandi* of the organism" be it human or non-human, "through practice and experience in an environment" resulting in embodied knowledge (Ingold, 2000, p. 360). Ingold exemplifies this embodied type of knowledge in the process of learning to ride a bicycle. "The facts that no novice has succeeded in sustaining balance and co-ordination on a first attempt," Ingold (2000) argues, "that the knack of riding a bicycle, once learned, is never lost, indicate that the exercise of the requisite sensory and motor skills leaves an indelible anatomical impression" (p. 376). Ingold concludes that while skills are learned over time they also grow into the organism's "neurology, musculature, even anatomy, and so are as much biological as cultural" (p. 360). Not all humans learn to weave like the Telefol, nor do all learn to canoe, ride a bicycle, or type a thesis. It is important to stress that given guidance and opportunity, an individual's skill set grows in accordance to the interrelation of his or her tasks, concerns, and preoccupations all of which focus attention on particular aspects

of the environment or draw the person to a different environment altogether. Skills are passed between generations, Ingold argues, "not by handing on a corpus of representations…but by introducing novices into contexts which afford selected opportunities for perception and action, and by providing the scaffolding that enables them to make use of these affordances" (p. 354). On this point Ingold is clear: the learning of technical skills and their incorporation into the human organism depends the provision of certain environmental conditions. These conditions include the necessity of the task, the suitability of terrain, the presence of mentors, and obtaining the needed equipment. "Obviously," Ingold states, "no-one can learn to cycle who does not have a bike to ride, and the environment must also include roads or tracks that are negotiable on two wheels" (p. 375).

Flowing from the idea that skill requires an education of attention and engagement, "rather than a mere mechanical coupling," Ingold's (2000) fifth component of skill suggests that objects made, result not from a pre-established design but from the regular movements used in their production. An example may help to illustrate this fifth component of skill. While paddling in North Western Ontario I began to learn how to make a wooden spoon by using a hot coal to burn a bowl into a small round of cedar and scrape out the ash with another stick. Finishing touches were done with a knife to make the thing more "spoon-like", but my spoon's form was obviously a result of my (un)skilled creative handling of the tools and materials used to make it. Indeed, the idea I had of what a spoon should look like had little bearing on the shape or functionality of my spoon. Had the form of my spoon been a manifestation of my mental image of *a* spoon, it would not have looked as it ended up. The actual form of my spoon came about

through the limited coordination of my movements with the wood, ember, and stick. The point being that the actual form of each object made skilfully is an original, though possibly modeled on other examples, which grows out of and shows the interactions and movements involving both the craftsperson and the material. Therefore my spoon was expressive of my own abilities and while guided by an imagined form, the subtleties of shape could not have been accounted for in any mental blueprint I may or may not have had.[15]

In addition to the production of artefacts, this example shows how tools help to engage the world relates to Potter and Henderson's (2001) emphasis on becoming familiar with a place through the use of traditional tools and technique. Reliant on intuition, *skill* is quite different from the application or deployment of *technology* as the performance of prescribed action (Ingold, 2000). Akin to the Greek term *tekhnē* meaning the art of a skilled craftsman, technique or skill immanently involves the powers of human perception and action in achieving a desired goal with, or without, a tool (Ingold, 2000). According to Lave (as cited in Ingold, 2000), this type of knowledge "constituted in the settings of practice, based on rich expectations generated over time about its shape, is the site of the most powerful knowledgeability of people in the lived-in world (Lave 1990: 323)" (p. 416). Through enskilment, Ingold argues, "learning is inseparable from doing" and "both [learning and doing] are embedded in the context of a practical engagement in the world—that is, in dwelling" (p. 416).

Returning to a previous example, let us examine what is required of the paddler to learn the kayak roll. As Ingold states, skill is "tacit, subjective" and "*typically* [italics

---

[15] This is not too say that all forms of production require such attention, "machinofacture" requires no attention from the operator, who is distanced and not in control or contact of the raw material. See Ingold (2000) Ch 15.

added] acquired through observation and imitation rather than formal verbal instruction" while technology is "encoded in words or artificial symbols, and can be transmitted by teaching in contexts *outside* those of its practical application" (p. 316). Surely most people probably learn how to roll a kayak in a pool by watching and imitating an instructor as well as other skilled individuals. However, verbal instruction and symbolic representations such as diagrams and "how to" books are often involved. Yet, the "how to" book does not provide knowledge of the skill, it provides information. A book provides neither a kayak nor a pool. This information must be brought to bear in the context of the skill, for it is impossible to learn how to roll a kayak while sitting in an armchair. One can gain information about rolling a kayak, but it is in the application that the person acquires skilled knowledge. "The novice becomes skilled," Ingold argues, "not through the acquisition of rules and representations, but at the point where he or she is able to dispense with them" (p. 415). Like a mentor, the book provides the novice paddler with certain clues to be used when he or she is properly equipped in a kayak, with a paddle, in a pool, or on a river. The intent of the kayaker is to learn a roll, not memorize the book. The "how to" book can be understood as a set of signposts that guide the learner along a path of enskilment.

This example allows me to clarify the distinction between *skill* and *task*. Righting an overturned kayak is a *task*. Different *skills*, some involving *tools*, can be used to accomplish the task. A *tool*, according to Ingold, "is an object that extends the capacity of an agent to operate within a given environment" (p. 315). Take, for example, the kayak paddle. As I have discussed, the narrative quality of using a paddle requires the attention and response of the paddler not only to his or her own movements but also to currents of

movement within his or her environment. Enabling a measure of control and agency, the paddle allows the kayaker to be intimately linked and responsive to aspects, or movements, within his or her environment. The paddle is a tool used by the participant to right an overturned kayak among other tasks. The rolling of a kayak is a skill that is made easier with the use of a paddle. However, technique itself does not *require* a tool. Should the paddle be lost, a skilled kayaker can use a "hand-roll" that requires only the coordinated movement of his or her body to right the boat. Hand-rolling requires greater body and boat awareness, and is more difficult to learn, than rolling with a paddle. Tools can further skill, but not all skills require tools.

As a form of knowledge, skill is contextual and does not lend itself well to presentation as a body of rules or instructions abstracted from context, though it can be represented this way (Ingold, 2000). Moreover, such knowledge is practiced and learnt through the active, perceptive, and sensual engagement of the performer with the materials and in the context that concerns him or her (Ingold, 2000). In skill, humans exercise "knowledge how" in which knowing and doing are inseparable. Technological knowledge is "knowledge that," and has a degree of independence from context. Existing apart from application, technological knowledge separates knowing from doing and must be coded and represented symbolically. Ingold (2000) asks the important question about the possibility of technology being used to augment skill. He concludes that where skill combines practice and knowledge, technology separates them, "elevating [knowledge] from the practical to the discursive, and reducing [practice] from creative doing or making to mere execution," (p. 316) effectively preventing a proper understanding and limiting the development of technique. Heidegger believes that technology removes the

poetic element of *tekhnē*, and "leads mankind [sic] even further from being," that is, a meaningful engagement with his or her life-world (Collins and Selina, 1999, p. 163). Using various examples from ORE, I will now examine the implications and complications of using technological knowledge and devices to engaging landscape create home. In addition, the examples show some possible effects, resulting from the interplay of skilled and technological knowledge, on the lived experience of ORE participants using tools and technological devices.

Technology and devices.

Technology, as Ingold (2000) uses this highly contested term, connotes the application of a corpus of *knowledge*, detached from human skill and perception, in order to achieve a practical result mainly through mechanical functioning. Technology, Ingold shows, is specific to Western society and implies that "a body of context-free, prepositional knowledge—namely a technology or, more generally, a culture—actually *exists* as such and is available for transmission by teaching outside the context of use" (p. 416). This type of knowledge has progressively increased with the rise of modern scientific methods and materials. The extent to which this abstract knowledge is applied leads to the objectification of humans from the products produced and the context of production (Ingold, 2000). Given my focus on connecting humans with places, the abstraction brought about in the use of technology is very important and speaks to Potter and Henderson's (2001) preference for traditional skills. Using a technological device such as a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit diminishes the participant's need, opportunity, and ability to develop skills and perception relative to the landscape in order to perform a task, such as locating one's self. The GPS unit encourages the user to take a

"bird's eye view" of the world. The "bird" happens to be flying very high, so high that the participant in this form of engagement no longer needs to see the detail of the land. Requiring very little perception of the landscape itself, the user is drawn into the device to get to a home or location—and can do so even in "white-out" conditions—rather than being drawn into the landscape in order to home.

The user of the GPS unit has one less reason to perceive or attend to the lay of the land, and thus may never develop skills and relationships with that place through this task. Rather, he or she develops a relationship with the device. Technology is narcissistic; it promotes meaningful connections with the technological gadget. Not only does technology influence current and future action and perception, in the case of the GPS and modern Western maps, they also erase some actions of the past, while presenting a more "objective" and "less storied" landscape. The GPS reinforces the stories of the dominant Western perspective by engaging the participant in a birds-eye view and withdrawing the need for embodied knowledge of place. Widlok (as cited in Ingold, 2000) argues that "both a map and a GPS depend on a history of human-environment interactions (observations, measurements, triangulations) from which the experiential aspects of the humans involved have been systematically eliminated to leave nothing but formalized, de-personalized procedures" (p. 430).[16] While all stories leave some things out, the technological way of perceiving the world denies the importance of personal experience and skilled engagement with one's environment.

A participant may be able to find his or her way through the landscape using a GPS unit, but this style of navigation does not situate the participant conceptually for

---

[16] In deciding which places, things, and experiences should and should not be represented on maps, cartography is a strong tool of colonialism and oppression.

developing a sense of home. While technology such as the GPS can abstract the practitioner from the landscape during a particular task, this is not to say that the participant remains as such, or that using the GPS unit somehow ruins their experience. In the absence of skill or a guide, navigation with a GPS may allow a participant entry into a thoroughly unfamiliar landscape.[17] Safety concerns aside, the GPS may allow a painter, for example, to visit and connect with a particular place through painting. Yet the person connects with and perceives their environment predominantly through the *skill* and *experience* of painting, and less through the task of navigating with a GPS unit. However, I do not think we should or could dissect and isolate the shifts in perception influenced by different skills on the lived experience of the individual, in this case a painter. Surely the shifts in perception are responsive to one another. The use of a GPS unit would likely effect the painter's perception of his or her environment and, therefore, his or her painting. Conversely, the painter's acute sensitivity to colour might influence what he or she encounters while walking to the site and using the GPS unit. Thus in ORE, practitioners, researchers, and participants are dealing with a play, influenced by the tools and technological devices we take into the landscape, between the skilled and technological knowledge.

The difference between a technological knowledge and a skilled knowledge is extremely pertinent to the types of knowledge that result from ORE. Technologies perform tasks *for* the person whereas skilled persons, sometimes with the aid of a tool, perform tasks. Therefore, when technological and skilled knowledge come together as they do in ORE, a dependence on technology reduces the need for skills that foster

[17] Here I use entry in a very pragmatic sense, different from the way that a skill draws a person through their perception into a landscape.

connections with the landscape, because technological knowledge is context-independent (Ingold, 2000). Different artefacts can foster varying degrees of enskilment and/or technological knowledge.

Ingold (2000) describes technology as using abstract knowledge to accomplish a task through mechanical functioning. Logically, within Western society "*technological improvement*" means further incorporation of context-independent knowledge into a device so that a current or new task can be more easily accomplished. A decrease in context-dependency requires less and less skill from the user. A GPS unit is often used in consort with a map and still requires the user to watch where he or she is going so as to avoid obstacles and identify objects. I would argue that, given the above understanding of *technological improvement*, the need to use a map and watch for hurdles presents itself as a "deficiency" in the technology. Map overlays incorporated into the GPS units now allow the user to track, display, and alert users to topographic features, thereby overcoming this supposed deficiency and requiring even less skill and perception of the environment on behalf of the user.

There are many instances to show how a technological device, such as a camera lens, which has been modified, with the development of auto-focus, requires less skill and perception form the participant. However, technical advances in *tools* abound in ORE: how are these to be interpreted? For example, backcountry skiers have witnessed significant changes in telemark skis and boots. Using Mumford's (as cited in Ingold, 2000) term, a ski boot might be best understood as a *technic.* As Ingold explains, a technic is a specific kind of tool: one that has been produced or shaped by humans. Thus, many common tools used in ORE such as paddles, stoves, and hatchets are, in fact,

technics. The use of technics requires skill, and therefore engages the participant in a context-specific field of relations. Moreover, most of these tools have been changed with the express purpose of altering and shaping one's engagement with and experience of their environment. Practitioners, therefore, can tailor the use of technics with different levels of complexity or specificity to the purposes of the program they are running. Moreover, researchers could examine the different engagement facilitated by varying technics.

Changes in white water kayak design are a good example of this. Significant research and effort goes into the production of multiple styles of kayak. These varying designs may facilitate very different experiences. The longer and straighter design of older kayaks facilitated running rivers and experiencing multiple rapids and flat-water sections. Newer, shorter and rounder designs have, in my experience, increased the tendency for paddlers to "stay and play" while congregating in a single location around a particular feature of the river. Researchers might be able to draw connections between boat design, differing place-based knowledge, and prominence of places in the recreation experience. How does a "play boater's" sense of a particular rapid differ from that of a river-runner? Which places, and senses of place, are significant and prominent? How, and to what extent, are connections made between places on the river? Do differing styles of participation and boat design influence inter-personal interactions? What attributes of the river do these groups identify with?

Ingold's (2000) affirmation that "technology erases skill" does not apply, turn up, or progresses simplistically. Equating complex gadgets with an advance in technological evolution would be a mistake, Ingold argues, for "to comprehend the technical

accomplishments of hunter-gatherers, or any other people for that matter, it is not sufficient just to look at their tools. We need to understand their knowledge" (p. 368). Furthermore, Ingold states, "up to a point, the simpler the tool, the more knowledgeable and skilled you have to be to be able to work with it effectively" (p. 368). An increased requirement of skill can be seen in the great balance, muscle control, and dexterity needed to use older telemark boots. Beyond fashion, however, changes in ski boot design likely occur in order to facilitate performance. Technical changes affect the expert just as they do the novice. It seems logical to assume that, predominantly, changes in the technical aspects of tools are not made by or for the novice whose performance is limited by skill rather than his or her tools. It seems likely that changes are made, for the most part, by and for the expert whose enskilment is limited by his or her tools. Moreover, it is the expert that has a greater familiarity with and can imagine greater possibility for design modifications in relation to the demands of new environments. As Ingold insists, imagination is a process of abstract thought that is dependant on our dwelling and familiarity with the world and the problems we face. Thus, we see most high-end equipment manufacturers sponsoring high-end athletes who use, abuse, test, and can suggest modifications to design.

Stiffer, lighter, warmer boots have not only made learning to telemark ski easier, but also made skiing possible on steeper terrain, in less favourable snow conditions, and in colder temperatures. Changes in equipment design allow for innovative skill in dealing with a variety of new conditions and possibilities. Let us not forget, however, the formative experiential aspect of skilled knowledge. It seems reasonable to assume that both the Inuit and the Aboriginal peoples of the Australian Western Desert, examined by

Ingold, have a hand in adapting and making the tools they use. This is not usually the case in ORE: Equipment changes rapidly and on a massive scale; those who use a tool are not necessarily involved in its design and production.[18] Moreover, a participant's choice of equipment can be influenced by social pressures to acquire the latest or most technical model. Therefore, changes in a tool's form do not necessarily account for a development in the user's knowledge. Just as an expert skier can perform wonders on very basic equipment, so a novice can use high-tech equipment with little skill. A shortened learning curve made possible by technical advances reduces the amount of time and experience with which one can enter challenging environments.[19] In ORE these environments can be hazardous. This means that participants may be entering places without the historical experience and perceptual adaptation needed to understand and function safely within an environment.

To exemplify the role of imagination and type of knowledge in determining whether an artifact is a technic or a technological device, I would like to briefly turn to an example from outside ORE. The context-independent knowledge built into technological artefacts can greatly shape the human perception of the world. However, technological devices can be converted, through an act of imagination, into a technic. The turntable is an excellent example of this. However dated, turntables are a technology used to play recorded music. However, this device has been imaginatively reinvented as a musical instrument, or tool, used predominantly in performing and improvising hip-hop music. Depending on the knowledge brought to bear, a turntable can be both technology and

---

[18] Though many people who are strongly engaged in their activity tinker and make their own improvements to equipment.

[19] The same could be said of the global environmental crisis. Technological advances have allowed for the achievement of tasks without attending to and developing a full understanding of the implications for our selves in relation to our environment.

tool. ORE professionals, researchers, and participants are faced with a balancing act between two types of knowledge, abstract and contextual. This does not appear to be an either/or situation: the abstract knowledge of technology always grows from, but may nevertheless prevent, contextual knowledge.

To exemplify the effects this interplay on formative experiences and a person's ability to create a sense of home, I would like to progress through three possible methods of forecasting weather. The task of predicting the weather is necessary in ORE and is often taught as a component of safety, logistics, and natural history. I begin with a weather radio as an example of a technological device, I move to a barometer as an example of a technic, and finish off with attuned human perception as an example of embodied skill requiring no tools.

The weather radio, as a technology, accurately describes the weather, and in so doing allows the outdoor leader to make certain decisions. To operate the radio requires only the flick a switch. However, the radio requires no perceptive learning or embodied knowledge about the landscape in which the leader finds him or her self. There is a whole host of placed knowledge and experience that allows the radio system to function as it does, these are, however, not made available to the leader of the trip at the point of using the radio. The leader, therefore, becomes completely dependant on the radio to predict the weather. Tools, on the other hand, facilitate skilled practice and draw the user further into the landscape in order to reveal new meaning and knowledge.

Let us examine a non-traditional tool used in predicting weather. Recently, wristwatch-sized barometers have become available. Certainly these devices help to accomplish the pragmatic necessities of predicting and monitoring the weather. Arguably

in doing so digital wrist-top barometers shift the user's focus away from other telling signs, but equally they serve as a harbinger for greater attention to environmental factors. Such an artifact might be thought of as embodying technological knowledge, yet still requiring skilled knowledge as well. One must learn how to use a barometer and relate it to one's activity and environment; alone the device is not enough to forecast conditions. Rather, it indicates air pressure, a measurement that when taken in series can be used to roughly predict changes in weather. Barometers are not fool-proof. The user must learn how to monitor the instrument, cope with it, take accurate readings, and adjust for changes altitude (which the user must also monitor) that may throw off his or her understanding of the conditions. Thus, barometers invite a double-check with other environmental signs. The need to place the readings of a barometer in the context of other environmental factors may lead the participant to inquire and understand more about the nature of air pressure, how frontal systems work, and dominant weather patterns in the areas she frequents. This learning, over time, may contribute to the user's intuition, skill, efficacy and sense of place.

Accomplishing the task of predicting the weather without the use of a tool or technology requires the observer to perceive the sky and other aspects of the environment in a particular way. Someone skilled at predicting weather learns through repeated experience and guidance to identify and understand useful patterns and signs, such as the height and shape of clouds and a haze around the moon, which may presage a coming storm. This skill may alter the value of the sky, clouds, and moon in that person's daily life. The better the individual is at predicting the weather, and the more he or she relies on this skill, the more it influences his or her behaviour, efficacy, and sense of what he or

she can and cannot do (such as witness climate change) or tolerate (such as air pollution or brightly light city nights that obscure the sky). Moreover, others identify a person by their skills and seek their advice; the sky and the individual's perception of it becomes an important part of personal and social identity. Skill, depending on how it is conceptualized, may have an effect on the person's sense of self and connection to the world around him or her. In this way skill may be central in mediating landscape but also in establishing identity and sense of place.

Tools broaden or deepen an organism-person's field of relations thereby altering their socio-environmental values and sense of place. Different tools and techniques engage the person within the environment in different ways. If technology or highly technical tools are used, the participant may require other practices and skills to stay "in touch" with their surroundings. Technological knowledge tends to supplant the need for skill and tools that engage one's environment, but require the learning of skills to deal with the device. Certain devices, such as the GPS, encourage a particularly technological and abstract form of knowledge. The degree to which and the way in which tools and technology engage a participant in their environment depends, to an extent, on the device itself, but also on the type of knowledge with which it is used. Practitioners and researchers, therefore, might consider not only the outward form of the technologies and tools used by ORE participants and professionals but also (a) the context or way in which they are used, (b) the type of knowledge upon which their use depends, and (c) the knowledge and meanings that result from their use. Tools and skill require creativity and choice in how an organism-person alters his or her landscape. Creativity is certainly involved in the skilled design, if not production, of technological devices. Such

equipment, however, may not provide for imagination and personal expression in actually accomplishing a task. Once produced, technology provides the user with rather limited choice and direction over the influence of the device on his or her relations. Each embrace of technology lessons the amount and ways in which humans must adapt to, learn with, and become familiar in our environment. Moreover, because technological knowledge is nomothetic, it lessons each person's ability to make his or her distinctive mark, to learn and act in his or her own idiosyncratic way and, thus, to develop and express his or her own identity in relation to his or her environment.

If ORE professionals and researcher are trying to develop a type of knowledge that binds people to place, we should surely try to account for the distinction between technological and skilled knowledge in the varying uses of various artefacts. As Potter and Henderson (2001) describe, traditional skills do connect people with places. However, skill and tool use do this not because they are independent of Western society or belong to a non-Western culture, as an (anti)modernism perspective would suggest. Skills connect people with places by engaging the participant in formative experiences that are intimately dependent on his or her environment. Technological devices used as such are context independent and largely narcissistic.

Consequently, formative experiences in connection with elements of one's physical environment, apart from the device, tend not to occur through the use of technology. In addition to safety and redundancy, the notion of formative experience provides ORE practitioners and teachers with a strong reason to teach powerful skills such as celestial navigation in the face of potent technology like the GPS.

While technology allows participants to transfer practices between contexts, in doing so we sacrifice a dependence and connection to place and resign a measure of our own agency to the device. Important learning, adaptation, and growth in relation to one's environment occurs through skill. Importantly, students need to be provided with the scaffolding that supports formative experiences and familiarity with a changing landscape. Instructors who are interested in helping students connect with place need to ensure that student's knowledge continues to grow along with, and is not supplanted by, the technical advances in the tools we use.

Instructors can foster student growth by being aware, addressing, and using the different types of knowledge within their programming. A leader interested in fostering a sense of home might begin teaching navigation with the GPS in order to gain entry into a landscape, because the GPS requires next to no contextual knowledge, of which the students have very little. Strategically, the instructor could then introduce ways of navigating that require more skill on the part of the student, such as the use of a map and compass and/or the learning or writing of stories and songs, much like the song lines of Australian Aboriginals, that guide the participant through the landscape. In this sense the students and leaders use the GPS as a back up, compensating for a lack of contextual knowledge, and focusing primarily on more traditional forms of navigation and wayfinding. A similar approach could be taken with learning to use stoves and cooking over a fire. The stove can buy time, while the instructor can provide the guidance and impetus for learning more context-dependant skill. But I must be clear, the technology does not directly aid or accelerate the learning of the skill; using a stove teaches little about selecting wood for a fire. In these examples, the technology clears a workspace for

the mentor to arrange the scaffolding that fosters enskilment. The practitioner concerned with connections to place needs to focus students' attention not on learning to deal with technological devices, but on enskilment.

Furthermore, Ingold's (2000) work on skill and technology allows for more specific language within ORE. Beyond using *technology* ubiquitously, ORE professionals, researchers, and students may find use in the subtle yet powerful distinctions between *tool*, *technic*, and *technology* related to knowledge, perception, attention, and experience. These terms help those involved in ORE to be more precise in accounting for the type of knowledge and artifact while avoiding ethnocentric language that implies technological and social evolution connected to "primitive" and "modern" civilisations.

The "simple" practices and tools to which (anti)modernism refers are not simple at all, in fact their use often require greater "know-how." By focusing on the design of the artifact we often neglect to account for the adaptability, complex field of relations, and knowledge involved in the use of an artifact (Ingold, 2000). Learning, therefore, can be enhanced within ORE by acknowledging the importance and value of attending not only to the physical practices and tools themselves but also the contextual relations required for their effective use. We can see, for example, that learning to identify tree species, wet and dry, as well as soft and hard wood is essential knowledge when teaching traditional fire lighting techniques. Importantly, through these contextual relations skill transcends mere doing to connect a student to place. As instructors in ORE, we should not neglect or downplay these contextual relations in favour of the more exciting performative aspects. Knowledge and use have been shown to be important factors in distinguishing whether a

particular artifact is a tool or technological device. Therefore we should not draw hard lines around the objects themselves. Used for navigation, a GPS unit is a technological device. Yet, it seems possible that the same unit could be used as a *tool* for teaching about the effects of technological knowledge on perceptual experience. Such a use may subvert the dominant Western bias favouring technology by calling students to account for the skills and context involved in the use of technological devices. This type of practice may also promote self-reflexive and critical thought, raising student awareness of various types of knowledge.

Shifting to a resource management perspective, understanding the affect of technological knowledge and skilled knowledge may help re-frame the notion of user conflict. As opposed to describing activities as motorized and self-propelled (focusing on the form of the artifact), we might consider how the varying degrees of technological and skilled knowledge inherent in the activity open up possibility for conflict. I have experienced the conflict that exists between sailors and powerboat users. Sailors more than power boat users feel and acknowledge that the other infringes upon their experience. The conflict is lopsided possibly because sailing is a highly contextual skill involving a large field of relations. The experience and skill of sailing depends on waves, water depth, wind direction, and movement of other boats. The technology within a powerboat means that users have to account for comparably fewer contextual relations. The technological knowledge within a powerboat liberates the user from context and therefore conflict, while the sailor whose experience is more dependant on the physical context is forced to account for and accommodate the powerboats. Thus, as researchers, we can more astutely appraise the effects of technology, tools, and technics on the

dynamics of the ORE experience. Context-dependant activities that involve a broad field of relations may be affected by and require the participant to attend to the relationship between self and other. Context-independent activities may not require as much attention to or be as influenced by the presence and activities of others.

Issues of self and other in relation speak also to identity. Skill development, Ingold (2000) argues, allows a person to "find his or her way in a world of human and non-human others, and… endows [him or her] with a specific identity" (p. 369). In the case of sailors and powerboat users the skills and knowledge involved partially define identity through conflict. I am, however, more interested in the creativity and self-expression that skill allows for in creating a sense of self and place. In this section I have explored skilled and technological knowledge along with tools and devices to show their influence on engaging one's environment. I will now look into how skill can communicate and contribute to identity. Using Ingold's theory to respond to Beringer's (2004) call for an ecological approach to self and identity, I examine a relational perspective along with some possible repercussions for ORE practice and research. Moreover, the examination of relational identity flows into the role of stories and symbolic objects as modes of sharing and perpetuating communal identity. I propose some possible changes to teaching and research practice, especially regarding LNT techniques and ways of framing an ORE trip.

Identity and skill

Ingold (2000) shows that the development of the machine has lead not only to the objectification of the human force of production in modern technology, but also to a mistaken assumption that such objectification is natural to all cultures and forms of

production. Technology, then, can be seen to operate regardless of the personhood of the user (Ingold, 2000). In other words, task completion is not influenced or expressive of the specific operator. The indifference of technology to context and individuality requires the person to be machine-like when using technology. Tied up in the increased use of technology, the insistence in Western society on individual freedom and adherence to strictly measured time, Ingold argues, "has made us, in a sense, strangers to ourselves" (p. 323). The person, therefore, must search out, develop, and express identity and place through other means such as exercising power, amassing possessions, or adopting status symbols. These other methods of identification are not my focus here; in this section I am concerned with the role of skill in developing and communicating identity. "The particular kinds of tasks that a person performs," Ingold argues, "are an index of his or her personal and social identity: the tasks you do depend on who you are, and in a sense the performance of certain tasks *makes* you the person who you are" (p. 325). The connection between skill and identity involved in coping within daily activities, Ingold contends, is common ground between Western and non-Western peoples that "exists at the very heart of our *own* society" (p. 323).

Skill plays a crucial role in mediating relations of self and environment. Not *mediating* in the Western sense, but rather as Ingold's (2000) creative process that establishes a poetic of dwelling. From the dwelling perspective identity and self grow out of a historical field of relations, therefore all self-realisation is ecological and continually happening in accord with the realisation of one's environment. Using the dwelling perspective, I will examine the realisation of self and environment by bridging identity formation and sense of place through skill. I am interested in how skill can lead to a sense

of interconnection and familiarity, allowing humans to make a home in a landscape. In what follows, I describe how skills are social and serve to form and communicate identity. Moreover, I delve into Ingold's (2000) conception of the relational self, connected to one's environment through exchanges of substance and experience, in order to show how symbolic markers of identity are not only shared amongst a group but are situated in active engagement with the environment. Some implications for ORE practice and research are given prior to discussing the role of skill in sensing and shaping landscape.

Deep-ecological ORE grounds an individual's ecological self-realisation in an innate spiritual connection to all life. Differently, the dwelling perspective begins by acknowledging that humans have an unavoidable connection to our environment, in which attentive behaviour and skilled action serve to create a home and identity. Instead of a spiritual connection, an environmental ethic from the dwelling perspective would derive from and be expressed through actions relative to one's environment. This ethic of action could, but does not necessarily, lead to a spiritual understanding of one's relation with all things.

As shown in the preceding section, performance and outcome of skill and tool use depend greatly on personhood and context (Ingold, 2000). Skilled action may be an intimate expression of the personal and social identity of the user. The result of the task, be it a finely carved walking stick or deftly finding the way once lost, makes a mark on the landscape that communicates and (re)affirms the identity of the performer. Through skill, humans weave themselves into the world. Moreover, the contextual nature of skill means that the person's ability and style of performance, as an expression of their

identity, depends on their environment. Therefore, context influences expressions and affirmations of personal and social identity, possibly contributing to a sense of place. This is one way in which a person's environment is woven into their identity. If we consider ourselves immersed in our environment, skill allows persons to weave themselves in to and out of the landscape.[20]

Through skilled activity an individual can build relationships with his or her environment that result in a personal, social, and possibly communal identity—a sense of how one *is* in relation to his or her socio-environmental surroundings. In this sense, then, identity and senses of place may result from maintaining a particular set and style of relationships. Ingold (2000) argues that one way people are identified is through the effects of their lives on the world around them. Discussing the social nature of skill, Ingold claims that "persons develop with specific aptitudes and sensibilities, that is as bearers of techniques" (p. 321). Furthermore, Ingold concludes, skill is used for interpersonal relations, craftsmanship, raising animals, and growing plants "not in a failed attempt to achieve emancipation from an alien world of nature, but in a successful attempt to draw the inhabitants of that world into an unbounded sphere of intimate sociality" (p. 321).[21] Through experiences of coping with aspects of one's environment, persons are characterized by their own skilled role in the environment. So, people may (re/in)form their identity based on their continually evolving (non-teleological) and

---

[20] I use "out of" as "made out of" not "abstracted from" the landscape.

[21] Ingold occasionally mentions interpersonal skills when describing skill and growth, yet he rarely uses examples of how interpersonal skills develop, choosing to focus mainly on rather technical skills. For this reason, I have also focused on these more "hands-on" skills. Further explanation, I believe, is required to explore interpersonal skills such as leadership, group dynamics, and conflict resolution. One significant difference, on first glance, is the ability of others to act with motives and intentions that are unclear or misunderstood.

responsive skilled relations with their surroundings, which include other humans (Ingold, 2000).

Providing an argument for what it means to belong in a place, for a landscape to be one's home, Ingold (2000) challenges the Western ethnocentric notion that to be Aboriginal is to have descended from ancestors that inhabited the land prior to the arrival of settlers.[22] Ingold (2000) differentiates between the dominant Western notion of the "family tree" that shows branches and connections between successive generations and a relational model. Using various examples from Indigenous life, Ingold spells out the implications of Deleuze and Guattari's (as cited in Ingold, 2000) notion of the rhizome for understanding the interconnection of ancestry, generation, substance, memory, and land. According to the relational understanding of selfhood and identity, explicit in the dwelling perspective, "persons are continually coming into being—that is, undergoing generation—in the course of life itself" (Ingold, 2000, p. 142). The organism-person is a nexus, a point of conversion, in the field of relations that make up life; or as Ingold (2000) states: "a locus of self-organising activity: not a generated entity but a site where generation is going on" (p. 142). This understanding of selfhood is not limited to non-European persons. In an examination of *The harvesters* (1565), a painting by Pieter Bruegel of rural life in the Netherlands, Ingold describes the social and physical nourishment of persons in relation to the communal harvest of crops. An individual's identity and sense of self are not closed off to the world by corporeal limits, rather they inhere to the relations developed and maintained through experience within his or her

---

[22] This issue is, of course, highly contentious and political. Ingold (2000) argues that the notion of descent and aboriginality based on genealogy is an inherently Western colonial conception. The use of such arguments by Indigenous persons, Ingold contends, counters their own traditional self-definition and demonstrates the violence that has been wrought on dislocated and disenfranchised persons within a society dominated by the Western perspective.

environment. Describing this process, Ingold states that "the formation of the self is, at one and the same time, the formation of an environment for that self, and both emerge out of a common process of maturation and personal experience" (p. 100). This process depends on *exchanges of substance* and *shared experiences* that result in a familiar environment, deeply connected to the individual's sense of who they are and what they can do (Ingold, 2000). Thus, to be one's self means to attend to and care for these formative relationships.

In addition to sharing experience, Ingold (2000) describes *exchanges of substance* as vital to developing sphere of nurture and a sense of home. Exchanges of substance involve physical nourishment. Ingold uses the examples of hunting and picking fruit, as well as "feeding and being fed, in the nurturance and sharing that characterises the everyday life of a camp—which may be envisaged, in turn, as a place upon which the trails of many people temporarily converge" (p. 145). Again in reference to *The harvesters,* the peasants work amidst a wheat field and share a loaf of bread, Ingold describes how "the cycle of production and consumption ends where it began, with the producers. For production is tantamount to dwelling: it does not begin here (with a preconceived image) and end there (with a finished artefact), but is *continuously going on*" (p. 205). These episodes of substantive exchange, such as collecting and eating blueberries at a portage trailhead or catching and eating fish for dinner, allow for physical growth as well as shared experiences, creating a sphere of nurture. Practitioners might try to connect scientific ecological knowledge, such as associations of landforms and vegetation types, with learning to identify, harvest, prepare, and consume edible wilds. This might encourage students to look out for particular vegetation types or river habitat

where they might find tea, berries, edible roots, or fish. Moreover, by emphasizing the social and communal nature of such activities, through attention to the structure of cook groups and rituals around eating, ORE practitioners may be able to foster social and communal behaviour that responds to and includes the landscape and vegetation types in a sense of place.

Not only as a way of reaffirming and growing one's identity, *shared experiences* with other beings are important for learning and developing knowledge in relation to particular places. By sharing experiences and exchanges of substance, beings and places influence not only our physical development but also the development of knowledge, that is, "the contribution of other persons is to orient one's attention...along the same lines as their own, so that one can begin to apprehend the world for oneself in the ways, and from the positions, that they do" (Ingold, 2000, p. 145). Therefore, from the relational perspective of dwelling, persons share "the process of knowing" (Ingold, 2000, p. 146) rather than relying on a form of education that hands down static, technological, knowledge from one person to another. This form of knowledge implies a degree of empathy, an ability to understand the perspective of the other. The meanings and values discovered within an individual's experience are always derived in, and mutually responsive, to a context that includes the skills, tasks, and stories of human and non-human objects and persons. Thus, to become familiar with a place is to share in the process of knowing with other persons who co-habit. Sharing experience and exchanges of substance both depend on skilled interaction within one's environment.

Through exchanges of substance and experience, "persons undergo histories of continuous change and development…they are grown" (p. 144). From the dwelling

perspective, "growth is to be understood not merely as the autonomous realisation of pre-specified developmental potentials, but as the generation of being within what could be called a sphere of nurture" (Ingold, 2000 p. 144). The sphere of nurture is a salient part of one's life-world constituted by socio-environmental relations that help to grow the individual (Ingold, 2000). Others' support of one's enskilment enables the sharing of experience and exchanges of substance that build a sphere of nurture in which identity and selfhood are closely connected with place. Within the relational perspective land is understood as the source of all life. However, to portray these interconnections from a genealogical perspective, Ingold concludes, is to refigure the land as a space to be occupied and is essentially colonial. To propose that Western practitioners and participants in ORE could ever achieve a local understanding of a particular environment similar to that of the First Nations would be disingenuous. The relational perspective might help Western researchers, practitioners and students think and act in ways that begin to foster a sense of home, as well as allow Aboriginal people to be defined and understood on their own terms. Raffan (1991) does suggest the concept of *nativity* to describe how a person of any culture might come to have a very deep personal understanding and connection to a place as a home that nourishes them. Nativity, Raffan argues, results from one's livelihood being dependant on acting with and caring for a particular place.

The forms of interaction that produce a sphere of nurture can involve and produce objects that hold common meaning for groups or communities (Ingold, 2000). In other words, the objects involved in an exchange of substance or experience acquire symbolism to those who are involved and/or are familiar with the context. Counter to the dominant

Western conception of signs, Ingold shows that the symbolism is not abstract meaning applied onto an object, but rather inheres in the object and is held in place through its use. This process is not specific to Indigenous people, Ingold argues, but is a hallmark of skill and can be found in Western society. In reference to Cottrell's (1939) study of locomotive drivers, Ingold shows how tools, such as the conductor's pocket watch, come to single out their users "in all their relationships, both within and beyond the field of employment" and, as the symbol of identity, the objects receive "lavish care and attention" (pp. 335-336). A paddle and the ability to portage may, for canoeists, be considered important aspects and markers of individual and group identity, both within the group and to non-group members. Those who adopt the symbol as a marker of identity prior to or without growing into the activity, or who act in a way that puts nothing personal into the symbol, are what Heidegger (1927/1962) might call *inauthentic*; or what non-Heideggerians might call "posers."[23] Further, these objects might also be shared and recognised as common symbols of identity derived through common experience, resulting in a group or communal identity.

Stories and meanings are embodied in objects involved in, or resulting from, the performance of skill and tasks (Ingold, 2000). For example, the canoe and the canoe paddle are both tools used in traveling along waterways, but for many Anglo-Canadians they have come to embody Canadian identity, attributes, and values that are also ascribed

[23] Anecdotally, and supported by Pohl, Borrie and Patterson (2000), participants in ORE often describe "feeling truly themselves" during a wilderness trip. According to Heidegger, Being-one's-self is never possible when we are absorbed in our every-day world of concern. We become ourselves by *projecting* ourselves (working towards a preferred future), and dealing with our throwness (our lot in life), to rise out of a fallen state of the They (the "rat race" that "they" say we should run). Yet it is impossible to remain in this heightened sense of being (Heidegger, 1927/1962). Being *fallen* means ceasing to struggle with the unified (true) self that cares for, and attends to, the interrelations of earth, sky, humans, and divinities (Heidegger, 1927/1962). Perhaps ORE allows participants to "feel themselves" by allowing them to rise out of a fallen state, build a projection, and act creatively to achieve it.

to Tom Thomson's *The Jack Pine* (a product of painterly skill and wilderness experience). These objects, according to Bordo (1992-1993) and Francis (1997), are said to embody and represent Canada and Canadians as adventurous, rugged, independent, and close to the land. Yet as Potter and Henderson (2001) describe, "for all too many Canadians, the homegrown cultural products, icons, artifacts" that result from and have come to symbolize a living landscape such as loons, canoes, and the Rocky Mountains "have less and less to do with our day-to-day experiences" (p. 21). A lack of personal experience with iconic tools, animals, and places results in a "'space of wilderness' that is empty of stories" (p.21). This notion of empty wilderness has the consequence, according to Potter and Henderson (2001), of distancing people from skills that once connected "Canadian" culture to the land as a network of places. These stories also shape and attune our attention to particular aspects of our environment, and provide particular common experiences that give meaning to landscapes places. In ORE, therefore, we must be cautious in selecting, telling, and writing stories because in so doing we select, tell, and write others' and our own identity.

I must emphasize that these stories and meaningful objects are brought out through the interaction of humans in their environment. Only through the activity do objects initially acquire and maintain a meaning that can be later abstracted from place and alive in the public, communal space, perpetuated through story (Ingold, 2000). Once the experience is lost and the activity ceases, the significance of objects diminishes, and for those who are unfamiliar with its context, the object no longer has relevance. "The more objects are removed from the contexts of life-activity in which they are produced and used," Ingold states, "the more they appear as static objects of disinterested

contemplation (as in museums and galleries)—the more, too, the process disappears or is hidden behind the product, the finished object" (p. 346). Ingold is not arguing that galleries and museums are necessarily static or disinterested, rather his argument is that objects and their meaning must be understand in relation to their context and use. Indeed, seeing and handling objects no longer in use, but which are relevant to one's own skills, might lead to a better understanding of one's own tools and practices. Understood in context, objects might help draw connections across time, and provide a semblance of a shared experience, and attune one's attention to his or her environment, while showing the fluidity of culture.

ORE practitioners and researchers might use adopted symbols such as a group name, inside jokes, or shared artefact, along with the stories and experiences that lie behind them as indicative of a shared identity anchored in place. Perhaps symbols of shared identity might display patterns over time, initially being rooted in common pop-culture, gradually influenced by skills, places, and experiences encountered throughout an expedition. Researcher might ask how, when, and in response to what do these symbols surface? How are they used politically within a group? How do they speak to the participants' sense of place and web of relations? Can artefacts be brought to a larger community as a way to influence socio-environmental responsibility?

The (re)formation of identity through skill may aid ORE leaders to help students adapt to and connect with place. Instructors may help students transition into an environment by creating the opportunity for students to take up familiar tasks, thus establishing and communicating an aspect of identity. This may give the student agency in a developing group dynamic and ethic of practice. Familiarizing students with

equipment, or using equipment familiar to the students may ease the transition to a new setting. Moreover, the dwelling perspective may lead to including creative components that result in tangible products, which entail intimate and challenging interaction with landscapes. Such curricular components might include woodcarving, painting, photography, or song writing. If trips were framed as building and contributing to culture, as opposed to escaping it, practitioners might be able to encourage the careful creation of objects that embody the student's relationship with their environment. These artefacts could be used to communicate their identity and sense of place not only within the group but also in a larger social context. This may encourage working with other teachers, as in the case of Bennion and Olsen's (2002) collaboration that brought together an adventure educator and writing teacher, to learn skills beyond travel and outdoor living that can be brought back to a student's larger community. Activities such as painting or song writing, if undertaken with the intent of communicating a sense of place, may foster or require greater attention to one's surroundings. Ingold allows practitioners and researchers to see that such an approach not only teaches writing or creative skills, but also may contribute to student agency in the processes of place making by reaffirming and communicating the importance of his or her experiences with the landscape to a larger community. To encourage social impact and relevance, the instructor might want to discuss the power and politics of various artistic media in shaping the meaning of places and encouraging students to consider the trail they wish to leave as an indication of their identity and type of places they want to contribute to building. Each skill reaffirms the identity of the person and shapes the meaning and value of that landscape. According to Crotty (1998), such creative activities form the basis of Heidegger's phenomenological hermeneutics.

When used to render experiences faithfully, creative acts engage participants in the generation of meaning that enrich their lives (Crotty, 1998).

If humans develop a sphere of nurture by writing themselves with and in the world and if actions produce and reaffirm the meaning of objects and persons, how might ORE practitioners consider Leave No Trace (LNT) practices? It seems logical that practicing LNT erases us from the landscape and perpetuates the idea that humans do not belong. We might interpret this as care for the land; yet LNT is a skill that uses tools (or technologies?) that only displace and alter our signature on the land. In choosing a camp stove over a fire, I am changing my signature on the land from carefully selected wood to mines for mettle and oil wells for fuel. Accounting for dietary restrictions, I can try to maximize exchanges of substance and broaden my sphere of nurture by picking local plants, hunting, fishing, and trading with others when possible as opposed relying on packaged tea or freeze-dried food. Instead of packing out all biodegradable waste, a group might decide to compost. While these decisions may well be ethical given local conditions, practitioners should not assume that LNT is context independent, by doing so we lose the poetic element of the skill, and resort to mere doing. Approaching LNT as technological knowledge forgoes an opportunity to help participants be attentive to their life style and field of relations. Decisions regarding LNT, it seems, might be responsive to a specific setting and weighed carefully in consultation with students. This is not an excuse to do away with LNT and act irresponsibly; it is, rather, a call to focus on one's relationship to places and beings within one's environment. Any consumptive aspect, from an interrelational perspective, should be balanced with care for the places, plants, and animals that provide nurture. The dwelling perspective challenges practitioners and

participants to subtly address the ethical and pedagogical implications of taken-for-granted environmental obligations like LNT, stove use, and slogans like "take only picture, leave only footprints." In ORE leaders' and participants' struggle and experience with negotiating LNT we again see the play between the dwelling perspective and Western modernity that Ingold (2000) describes as the hallmark of industrial life. How do ORE participants negotiate the dominant expectations within the sub-culture of ORE regarding LNT behaviour in "wilderness areas" as well as a desire to have our existence acknowledged or reflected within that environment?

Potentially a powerful implication of the dwelling perspective, the notion of weaving could be used to frame an educational expedition. Having students trail a metaphorical thread, and examine the actual trail they leave and use, leaders could create a powerful way to encourage participants to attend to exchanges of substance and experience within their movement and interactions with others. Using such frames, instructors could help students become aware of the rhizomic nature of their socio-environmental relations. Such practices may help students and instructors move beyond understanding the landscape as a mere setting for their activities and towards understanding it as an active contributor to the success and nature of their experience. Participants might teach each other how to identify threads in the non-human world (such as weather patterns) thereby developing further skills. If each student can become aware that they leave a trail and a mark on the world, leaders can then enquire about the kind of mark they wish to leave. ORE leaders might emphasize "leave *your* trace" as opposed to "leave no trace" practices. *Your* is not meant as a command, but as a way of encouraging ownership. This allows participants to reduce "impact" in ecologically sensitive

landscapes, while incorporating creative components to maximizing impact within a larger socio-environmental environment through actions that spare locales and present the meanings of places, along with one's identity, to the world.

Western practitioners of ORE may be able to take what we usually think of as an interior experience that mediates personal understanding and place it within a larger context as formative of culture and social meaning. Just as students follow the threads of past trips, laid out in guidebooks, journals, and personal accounts, future travellers and residents may recognise and follow the threads left by those presently within the landscape. Practitioners can, therefore, create a semblance of spatial and temporal continuity making both the past and future relevant to present actions. Following threads backwards incorporates the past by being able to "read" the landscape through natural and cultural history, trip journals, and personal accounts. Each student's personal history and life "back home" can be connected to their present experience by attending to ways in which food supplies, fuel, and clothing as well as family experiences, meaningful stories, fears, and/or religious affiliations, or cultural traditions influence their experience. Being responsive to others currently in the area, and by acting in ways that future travellers will appreciate, students can extend their thread into the future. From this perspective, leading a life that left no trace would be a shame.

Landscapes, Places, and Skill

Insights into skill and identity in relation to place allow me to turn more squarely to Raffan's (1991) call for teaching greater knowledge that binds people to place. Therefore, in this section I examine some ways that environment influences skill development and perception leading to different senses of place. Moreover, I propose that

if researchers and practitioners are interested in understanding and fostering relationships with place, examining fields of relation may provide a subtle way to do so, given relational identity and the contextual nature of skill, that does not rely on a somewhat dubious distinction between a focus on activity and setting. To raise possible approaches to understanding place within highly transient activities of ORE, I examine Ingold's (2000) notion of wayfinding between places as nodes within a network joined by paths or flows. The notion of flows and movement allows me to address the importance of synchronizing one's tasks with the rhythms of others and the non-human world in order to feel at home and become familiar with a place or flow.

Understanding and becoming aware of these rhythms and their nature opens up the possibility of an organism-person actively building places that accommodate these cycles. Comparing Ingold's understanding of place and language with Stokowski's (2002), I try to move past place as purely discursive within the human realm. In doing so I look to examples within ORE of the connection Ingold (2000) makes between experience and story that is reflective of Heidegger's (as cited in Crotty, 1998) phenomenological version of the hermeneutic circle. Thus ORE is left with a version of place making that occurs dialogically in relation to all aspects of one's environment, both human and non-human. The gathering of various environmental domains introduces Heidegger's (1954/1993) notion of the *fourfold* and his emphasis on *sparing* as an ethical approach to being and building places. In light of these notions I examine whether wilderness is sparing of the fourfold. Importantly, I try to explore and forward some options for embracing our role in building places through ORE and attempt to show how,

through creativity and attention, we might work towards Hull's (2000) suggestion that we celebrate and cultivate our relationship with our environment as a dance and celebration.

Sensing a place.

Understanding skill as a form of mediation predicated upon the development and communication of socially meaningful relationships and objects allows me to now argue that one's perception of the environment depends on the skills used in the tasks one chooses or is required to undertake. Ingold's (2000) perspective on skill as creatively working with and attending to a field of relations opens up the possibility to play with and refine the notion of context and its meaning to the participant. The distinction between activity and setting used by Mannell and Kleiber (1997) in locating participant's attention has also been used by Haluza-Delay (1999) to argue for greater attention to environment during adventure education and is further seen in the environmental-adventure education distinction. By *activity* authors (Mannell & Kleiber, 1997; Haluza-Delay, 1999) seem to refer to the physical performance of the participant, and by *setting*, they appear to mean the surrounding context for an activity. Moving past the notion of skilled activity as mere doing directed by an isolated human mind, skill as a synergy within a system involving a number of components within an organism-person's field of relations blurs the distinction between activity and setting. To reiterate (see page 89), these types of skill are learnt through mentorship and guidance in the proper context with the proper equipment. By practicing, watching, and being shown, the novice learns to attune his or her attention and movement to particular elements of the environment in order to accomplish a particular task.

From the dwelling perspective all skill is contextual and involves fields of relation. A skill cannot be performed in a vacuum. Making a hard distinction between setting and activity is problematic, because skill performance requires an attention, in some way and to some extent, to aspects of one's environment. Instead of using the activity-setting dichotomy, I argue that the participant's attention is moved to the field of relations necessary for accomplishing the task at hand. Researchers and practitioners might look to the field of relations and perception required by the specific task in order to understand how participants' attention is focused within their environment.

Both the activity and the environment can have a large effect on how individuals see, hear, and feel (Ingold, 2000). Ingold uses Gell's (1995) ethnography of the Umeda of Papua New Guinea and Carpenter's (1973) of the Inuit to show how the environments of dense tropical forest and treeless arctic tundra, respectively, effect the individual's sensory perception. Under such conditions, Ingold states, the Umeda have developed acute and extremely sensitive hearing while the Inuit rely on amazingly accurate eyesight to draw themselves into, and successfully engage, their environment in order to accomplish a task at hand. Within these examples the Umeda and Inuit rely heavily on this embodied knowledge for their livelihood.

The sailor, for example, might also rely on fishing, transportation of goods, instructing others, or professional racing for a livelihood. The sailor is immersed and completely reliant on perceptions of continually shifting wind strength and direction. Sailing requires a person to perceive wind in different ways; the sound and feel of it passing over her ears helps locate direction, seeing patterns on the water's surface allows her to follow gusts and evaluate wind strength. These skills are learnt over time, with

guidance, and actually create embodied knowledge. The sailor perceives differently, she will always have a feel for the wind and will always be able to "read" water. The perception of wind, the development of eyesight, and the accuracy of hearing are not innate characteristics, they are skills learnt in a rich and supportive community and environment from a young age. The more time one spends engaging in a task, within a particular context, and with guidance and support, the more skilled one may become. I learned to sail beginning at the age of eleven, and continued racing, teaching, and honing my skills until the age of twenty-three. My livelihood does not depend on sailing; I have, nonetheless, acquired embodied knowledge about wind, waves, and whether. Moreover, this is knowledge I can pass on to my children or friends, not through genetics, but by taking them sailing, showing them weather patterns, helping them to anticipate gusts, and tune their sails accordingly. Yet learning must occur on a body of water with wind in order for the landscape to influence skill development, embodied knowledge, sense of place, and identity.

Instead of employing an activity versus setting dichotomy to address how a participant's attention is focused (Haluza-Delay, 1999; Mannell & Kleiber, 1997), the notion of a field of relations may allow practitioners and researchers to be more subtle and precise. Conceiving of fields of relation may help to emphasize the phenomenological place of the performer within the environment, as opposed to understanding him or her as acting upon a static setting. From a relational perspective, attention to "setting" might be better understood as performing skills that incorporate a field of relations extending further away from the body (such as predicting the weather or watching for wind patterns while sailing). A focus on the "activity" might be better

described as performing a task that requires focused kinaesthetic skill, a field of relations much closer to the body (such as challenging white water canoeing). Both canoeing and forecasting the weather are; however, "activities" or tasks that require skill and engagement with context, they differ in the relations required. This relational approach might lead to a more subtle description of how a participant's attention is focused relative to his body, the position from which he necessarily negotiates his life-world (Ingold, 2000).

In paddling a rapid, for example, a participant's attention might be focused on the relationship between strokes, features of the river, and movement of the water. The paddler might describe how he focuses on the twist of his paddle relative to the current in the water in order to navigate a feature in the river while measuring the movement of his boat relative to a tree on shore. This provides a more specific reading of the relationship between, and relative meaning of, the skills and tools used on the landscape. The meaningful relationships that exist within this performance cannot accurately be described as "activity" or "setting" focused. Through the skill, this paddler is focused on negotiating particular relationships between aspects of his environment in order to accomplish a task.

As way of further exploring how differing skill creates different settings, let us compare two individuals with different tasks and levels of skill that share an experience in the same landscape at the same time. Suppose two paddlers, one beginner and one expert, share a canoe and are running a class II+ rapid (intermediate). The beginner is in the bow, and the expert is in the stern. Upon completing their run, we might reasonably expect that where the novice paddler required intense focus on each immediate task and

movement, the expert had time to scan the rapid looking for the best path, instruct the bow paddler on strokes, and keep an "eye open" for hazards. Both persons may have been focused during their respective and shared tasks. The beginner, attending to paddle strokes, may have been the immediately occupied with the body-paddle-partner-canoe-wave context. The expert, adept at paddle strokes, concerned with teaching and navigating, might have perceived a larger context. A field of relations comprised not only of the body, paddle, and canoe, but also of the various features of the rapid, analysis of her partner's performance and movements, as well as potential dangers. Examining the specific field of relations attended to by a person and required by a task may allow a teacher, researcher, or reflective practitioner some assessment of how the environment is perceived by the participant.

Practitioners can achieve a task through very different methods; each method changes the orientation of the person relative to his or her environment. In addition, each method presents the earth differently. Navigation, for example, can be accomplished using a guide, written directions and landmarks from trip journals, sketches such as those used for climbing routes, the stars, a map and compass, and/or a GPS unit. Each of these methods draws or conceptually orients the participant to their surroundings in different ways. The GPS unit requires a birds-eye-view. While being shown a route one's moves through the landscape as though immersed. Celestial navigation may encourage the sense that one is at the centre of a moving sphere. Normal topographic maps used in ORE present the earth as a surface to be occupied, and finding one's way means travelling *over* the land by referring to static objects on the map (Ingold, 2000). Being guided or

following a journal reveals a landscape to be inhabited, one travels *through* a world in motion (Ingold, 2000).

Ingold (2000) draws a distinction between two "styles" of knowing where one is and refers to them as navigation (moving over the land) and wayfinding (moving through an environment). In navigating, persons travel between to separate points in space; to find one's location means relating the landscape to identifiable features on a map. In navigation, Ingold (2000) explains, places are understood as static point-specific locations. Through wayfinding, persons travel "between places in a network of coming and going" and to "know where one is" means to "connect one's latest movements to narratives of journeys previously made, by oneself and others" (Ingold, 2000, p. 155). In reference to *The harvesters* Ingold states "there can be no places without paths, along which people arrive and depart; and no paths without places, that constitute their destinations and points of departure" (p. 204). Wayfinding involves a narrative or temporal quality that occurs as we move. In wayfinding, places are considered to be a vortex or familiar convergence in what Ingold calls *flows*. Flows are patterns of movement such as changing vistas, air and water currents, and the march of time. In wayfinding, Ingold (2000) stresses, "we *know as we go*, from place to place" (p. 229). Vistas open out before the person and close off behind him or her in a particular sequence that when mastered can provide direction (Ingold, 2000). Mastering a region, then, means understanding the flow of vistas along all possible routes between places (Ingold, 2000). Wayfinders perceive flows and adjust course based on them. The sailor, for example, perceives and makes micro adjustments to course and sail trim based on a combination of the flow of air, the movement of waves, the heel of the boat, and the currents within the

body of water. A river flows between places and takes a person between towns, cities, and campsites.

Authors such as Warren (2002), Haluza-Delay (1999) and Raffan (1991) have expressed concern over developing environmental attachment and respect through ORE because of the transitory nature of the majority of activities. Ingold's (2000) notion of wayfinding allows us to see how, given time and experience with a particular flow, a person may develop a sense of place or familiarity within movement. A paddler can get to know the flow and become at home while moving with a river. While paddling, one can develop a sense of the changes of vista along the course of a familiar river. The canoe guide may negotiate rapids, estimate distances, and find portages with seemly little effort. Conversely, being unfamiliar with the twists, bends, and drops of a river can be very disconcerting for the newcomer; he or she may require intense concentration while paddling.

The distinction between navigation and wayfinding and the concept of travel as narrative along a path previously travelled may provide an opening to integrate ideas of travel and movement into the thinking around place in ORE literature. Wayfinding, then, may provide an effective way for practitioners to help themselves and students begin to perceive their environment from the dwelling perspective. Using trip logs to wayfind can become more than an exercise in cultural history. By using explorer's journals one is, in a way, being guided by that explorer. This may help to demonstrate and involve the student in the temporality of landscape. Similarly, celestial navigation may reveal the continual movement of their surroundings, a world in flux.

Ingold (2000) describes places as vortices within flows, because even familiar places are not still. The world continually moves around us. Despite this we develop a sense of place, because we become familiar with the various flows that converge where we find ourselves. We are able to relate to the markings these flows have left in the landscape. Moreover the idea of places as vortices may allow ORE practitioners and researchers to examine a sense of place based on a person's perception and response to various flows that contribute to a place. The flow of footsteps on a marble staircase over time leaves a depression, greasy hands leave marks, rivers cut rock, and glaciers raze mountains. Place in this sense, like landscape, is temporal. Within this movement humans learn to perceive and understand particular flows, develop skill and have authorship over their own flow and trace. Humans are themselves changed by flows. According to Ingold, "the world *opens itself out*" (p. 326) to a person when they can allow their tasks and skills to engage and respond to the human and non-human rhythms in one's environment such as tides, winds, and repetition of day and night. Regarding the process of adapting one's movement and perception to one's environment, Ingold (2000) states, in reference to *The harvesters,* that "only the sleeper, oblivious to the world, is out of joint—his snores jar the senses precisely because they are *not* in any kind of rhythmic relation to what is going on around. Without wakeful attention, there can be no resonance" (p. 207).

The task for ORE practitioners may be seen as identify and understand the place of, and reasons for, "snoring" while trying to encourage wakeful attention in participants. Practitioners might incorporate a ritual whereby campsites are selected and examined based on the flows present at a particular place. To some extent we try to ensure tents are out of the wind, away from animal paths, and will not be flooded. We ensure that latrines

are placed far enough from water sources and that kitchens are down wind from tents. We might further incorporate our own patterns of movement in and around the campsite; instructors might attend to use patterns both in setting and breaking camp. Moreover, students might be asked to orient and organize their camp based on attention to particular flows such as the rising sun or prevailing wind. The focus on flows in a particular place, or repeated day after day in establishing camp, may help draw student's attention to the dynamism, patterns, and cycles within their environment and how their own movements and behaviours shift and adjust in relation to human and non-human flows.

Troubling for those concerned with fostering a sense of place, practitioners or participants are often unable or unwilling to experience a flow or a place, a river or summit, many times over or for an extended period of time. Yet the notion of being attentive to flows and the temporality of place and landscape might help us "compress" our experience of place, that is, have a "thinker" sense of place despite a relatively short stay. The use of explorer's journals, films, historic photographs, and an ability to read the topography, can provide what might be thought of as a "compressed" experience of place, allowing the participants to gain a better understanding of the flows over time in a particular place. While not a replacement for time and experience, such materials might help participants engage and fall into the rhythms of a place more easily.

While sense of place is usually thought of in a holistic way and this is a reasonable way to conceive of it, Ingold's (2000) work allows us to also see that an individual's sense of place, depending on their skill, may derive from very specific attributes of the environment. As researchers and pedagogues, we may be able to identify and relate particular aspects or senses of place with the individual's tasks at hand and

skilled behaviour. We would expect, then, that a kayaker's sense of place within the Grand Canyon would be different, and show a different perspective, than someone overhead using a hang glider. In addition, sense of place would also differ in relation to skill level and experience. This, of course, means that as researchers we will require subtle ways of measuring and gathering data that will allow the participant to express their perception as influenced by task and skill. Moreover, researchers will need to know what to look for. Ingold's (2000) use of flows might give us an indication. Attention and reaction to these flows within speech, practice, or writing might give the researcher some idea of differing perception and meaning, or at least prompt us to delve further in discussion with a participant. Moreover, researchers might examine the role of flows in connecting disparate places, the way a river connects campsites, in order to understand how sense of place is developed through travel. Which flows do participants include or exclude from their experience? Are river and train-travel included but not bus-travel? How do these relate to novelty? Can practitioners help draw connections between participants' every-day life and their experiences on an outdoor trip by using flows? In order to connect disparate and seemingly disconnected places such as wilderness and cities, might practitioners chose to paddle a portion of a river that begins, ends, or passes close to a participant's home?

Differing tasks and skills require attention to different fields of relations, resulting in the perception of and relation to a different context. The practice of skill and meaningful elements of the context emerge simultaneously out of the person-environment interaction over time. In retrospect, this process is clearly visible to me in an experience I had while tracking game in Kenya. Tim, the ranger I was working with, had years of

experience and could spot and identify an animal from a long distance. My eyesight is very good, yet I was unable to distinguish the animals from their surroundings. Through experience and practice Tim had developed perception and understanding of his environment. Compared to me, Tim was able to attend to a wide field of relations that allowed him to see, relate to, and derive meaning from a literally different landscape. Where I saw no giraffe, Tim saw them. What I thought was a boulder, Tim knew to be an elephant. Given his experience with the flow of elephants in relation to the flow of tree growth, Tim knew that a forest of *Acacia tortilis* once grew where I saw only savannah grasses, and that therefore the area was no longer frequented by buffalo weaverbirds. What I am suggesting is that sense of place relates to the fields of relations and the environmental perception required by, and developed through, skill in specific tasks. Engaging in particular tasks and practicing requisite skills over time will contribute to developing a perception of place.

Researchers might also expect, based on the influence of skill on environmental perception, that guides' sense of place would be different from their followers, and that persons' with a long history of participation may have keener perception than those who have participated less in an activity. Longitudinal studies or comparisons of novice and veteran participants may reveal differences in environmental perception and sense of place. In addition, my work with Tim suggests that as learners and mentors share points of view, the learning process likely influences a learner's sense of place and perhaps that of the instructor. Therefore, while ORE usually conceives of an instructor's role as teaching skills (both hard and soft), researchers and practitioners might want to also consider that, as an education of attention, enskilment contributes to a particular sense of

place. Instructors might bring various elements and flows within the environment to the student's attention by incorporating them into an activity or daily life. Such elements and flows may provide a greater understanding of the movement, beings, and stories—past and present—which contribute to a place.

As I have described skill as social, Tim's performance communicates and reaffirms his identity. Tim, with good reason, was fiercely proud of his abilities. He identified himself, and was identified, as an expert tracker, ranger, and birder. Importantly and in connection to building places, Tim's ability to track game enabled him to act for its protection, thus having a real impact on the landscape. Therefore, I argue in the following section, that dependent on perception, and expressive of identity, skill and task also shape the landscape. Perception of and impact on one's environment through the mediation of different skills and tasks may lead to very different landscapes and senses of place, both for one's self and for others. A participant's identity and sense of place, therefore, grow over time in relation to the skills that he or she chooses, or is forced by circumstance, to learn throughout life. Borrie and Roggenbuck's (1996) notion of an "authentic wilderness experience" might overshadow the relevance of other types of experience given one's personal history and identity thereby normalizing the meaning and relevance of wild places. Moreover, these practices, the resulting identities, and senses of place are always in relation to and influenced by others'.

I am not trying to argue that all skill creates socio-environmentally responsible attitudes, just that skills engage and influence a person's perception of their environment and provide a way for participants and practitioners to becoming aware of, and responsive to, cycles and rhythms in their environment. A logger who is skilled at felling

trees in a clear cut will perceive and see meaning and value in a forest very differently than a logger who practices selective harvesting techniques. Both the loggers will see differently than a painter who is skilled in depicting colour and movement. Yet both loggers and the painter are skilled; their practices speak their identity and influence the landscape differently. The dwelling perspective, after all, is pre-ethical (Ingold, 2000). Yet skilled activity has ethical implications, because it is reflexive and influences human and non-human elements with an environment and, therefore, builds and changes the nature of places. I do not attempt to address and analyse these ethical issues, as they are highly contextual. Rather, I examine Heidegger's (1954/1993) notions of the *fourfold* and *sparing* as possible guides for ethical consideration. I address how these relate to building places in the following section.

Building places.

Landscape, from the dwelling perspective, is far from an objective stage to be overlain with symbolic cultural meaning. Rather it is continually manifest through the local socio-environmental reality that includes the activity of humans in their daily lives (Ingold, 2000). Ingold's (2000) temporal notion of landscape posits that day-to-day activities, the rhythms of human life, are part of the environment and are forces that shape landscape. In other words, our life-world is the result of ongoing creative processes. Landscape, Ingold states, is not purely human or purely natural but "through living in it, the landscape becomes a part of us, just as we are a part of it" (p. 191). Meaning is not *attached* to objects and places, but rather *inheres* to the elements of the environment that are mobilized in living. Thus in living we grow or build places (Ingold, 2000).

Stokowski (2002) cited the "typical" definition of sense of place as referring to "an individual's ability to develop feelings of attachment to particular settings based on combinations of use, attentiveness, and emotion" (p. 368). The meaning of a locale for a person, according to Ingold (2000), depends on his or her particular skills, tasks, and life-world. One's sense of place flows from involvement in that place. Deeper integration of the individual into the environment through exchanges of substance and embodied knowledge may lead to greater identification with that locale, a more profound sense of place, and reinforcing the place itself. While it is likely that Ingold would agree with Tuan (1991) and Stokowski (2002) that language holds political power relative to place, he would surely disagree that language creates the meanings *attached to* places in a process of social construction. Tuan (1991) and Stokowski (2002) emphasize how the moral dimension of place making and unmaking, through a dialogic process of living in an environment, blurs the distinctions between self and place. Yet in Stokowski's version of place construction, dialogue appears to involve only humans, who then apply social or discursive meaning to land and objects. Refuting Tuan, Ingold states "I cannot accept the distinction… that an environment is 'a piece of reality that is simply there', as opposed to the landscape, which is a product of human cognition, 'an achievement of the mature mind' (Tuan 1979: 90, 100)" (p. 193). According to the dwelling perspective language is a skill that employs "speech… as the embodiment of feeling" (p.147), and because feelings are a mode of "active and responsive engagement" in the "felt environment" (p. 411), language itself is responsive to the context in which it is used, including the influence of the individual's tasks within the context (Ingold, 2000). The form and meaning of a place should not, therefore, be relegated only to human discourse but rather

understood to emerge out of the combination of landscape, a person's role in their environment, as well as his or her skilled use of language (Ingold, 2000).

Experience builds places and their stories, which further shape one's own and others' experience of those places and the generation of new stories. This cyclic process engages humans in Heidegger's version of the hermeneutic circle (Crotty, 1998). Moreover, this cycle shows why story and language do, from the dwelling perspective, play an important role in building places. Common stories that hold sway over "Canadian" imagination, identity, and sense of place include works of art like Thomson's *The Jack Pine* or Robert Service's poem *The Cremation of Sam McGee*. Both of these works are the result of a particular person's skilled engagement with particular places but have grown to shape others' experience of Algonquin Park and the Yukon, respectively. Stories and narratives of past movement, according to Ingold (2000), are used within familiar territory to locate one's self in place and time. Salient for ORE, Ingold argues that stories are important for helping newcomers grow familiar with places, because understanding them as dissociated points on a map does not provide insight as to the history and narrative that gives character to a place. "Endlessly generated through comings and goings of their inhabitants, [places] figure not as locations in space but as specific vortices in a current of movement, of innumerable journeys actually made" (p. 238). Thus, far from using any story abstract from location, ORE practitioners should strive to use local stories, that describe places that the students will actually encounter in order to help the participant move past the conception of place as a point on a map, and incorporate their own coming and going into a longer narrative of the place.

As a way explicating how places come into being and hold meaning I would like to compare a brief passage from Ingold (2000) with one from Stokowski (2002). "If," Ingold states, "we recognise a man's gait in the pattern of his footprints, it is not because the gait preceded the footprints and was 'inscribed' in them, but because both the gait and the prints arose within the movement of the man's walking" (p. 199). Stokowski, citing Hester's paper on local control within tourism development, argues that not all sacred places "were striking, exotic, or quaint; they were, indeed, 'humble places…that provided settings for the community's daily routine' (p. 10). Understanding the role of these settings in forming a communal sense of place places [sic] protected both community and individual identity" (p. 379). From the dwelling perspective Stokowski seems to be putting the "cart before the horse" for surely the settings did not produce a "communal sense of place," but rather the sense of place, setting, and identity—like Ingold's gait and prints—arose together out of "the community's daily routine"—akin to Ingold's perambulator. Moreover, protecting the settings alone, without allowing for the daily routine, would do little to sustain and perpetuate communal or individual identity, except possibly by embalming it with nostalgia. Ingold, while analysing *The harvesters,* describes that

> A place owes its character to the experiences it affords to those who spend time there—to the sights, sounds, and indeed smells that constitute its specific ambience. And these, in turn, depend on the kinds of activities in which its inhabitants engage. It is from this relational context of people's engagement with the world, in the business of dwelling, that each place draws its unique significance. (Ingold, 2000, p. 192)

This process, therefore, involves a relational and temporal conception of landscape. Ingold was inspired and guided by Heidegger (1954/1993) as well as Aboriginal peoples' self-definition in relation to the land. According to Ingold "to inhabit the land is to draw it to a particular focus, and in so doing to *constitute* a place. As a locus of personal growth and development, however, every such place forms the centre of a sphere of nurture" (p.149).

Ingold's (2000) understanding of place enfolds social relations, which may include non-humans, as a subset of ecological relations along with the activities of daily life. Stokowski (2002) recognises that places are built from interactions and are not solely individual. Places exist in shared language, she argues, and are discursive. Quoting Ryden, Stokowski (2002) states "'places do not exist until they are verbalised, first in thought and memory and then through the spoken or written word.' The reality of place emerges and is confirmed in the common symbolic languages and discourses of people" (p. 372). Stokowski's seems to understand the temporality of landscape, as evidenced in her contention that "what is visible 'on the ground' at any given time is only the working out of one version of reality, promoted by a set of social actors who have succeeded in using their power and position to advance their own ideals" (p. 380). However, I would argue that contested landscapes and places show the convergence of many realities. Moreover, while power is played in discourse, it is not "worked out" solely in human society abstracted from, and then applied to, the land by the "winner." Rather, struggles play out in action by working with, shaping, and being shaped by an environment and those who dwell therein. Stokowski's version of place construction appears not to recognise the importance of experience, skill, and landscape in shaping our perceptions,

which structure and give shape to our thoughts and feelings. Places come to exist not only through speaking them, but also in our actions that shape our landscape. As Ingold consistently argues, based on Heidegger (1954/1993), we can only think the thoughts we do because we are socio-environmentally situated; abstract thought and meaning does not precede human's experience of the world, thought and meaning grow out of our experiences. Arguing for awareness of a relational and less confrontational politics of place, Stokowski (2002) states "we can and do make 'my mountains' into 'our mountains' through shared language, stories, myths, images, and behavior" (p. 381). Based on Ingold, I would add *skill*, *perception* and *experience* to this list. Moreover, places can be built both on the ground and in our imagination (Ingold, 2000). The ways one acts towards and within a place shapes landscape and relates stories and artistry all contribute to and form one's sphere of nurture.

Ingold (2000) shows how human language, social activities, and skills are embedded within larger processes of life and the temporality of landscape. Looked at over a long enough time scale, humans, plants, rivers, rock, glaciers, and tectonic plates—indeed the whole world—moves together, each element responsive to all others. "Thus," Ingold (2000) states, "the rhythmic pattern of human activities nests within the wider pattern of activity for all animal life, which in turn nests within the pattern of activity for so-called living things, which nests within the life-process of the world" (p. 201). Regarding the building of places out of such an interrelated world of activity, Ingold (2000) quotes Heidegger's statement that "to build is in itself already to dwell" (p. 199). Akin to Ingold's notion of drawing one's environment into focus, to Heidegger (1954/1993) *building* brings the *fourfold* into a thing and brings the thing forth as a locale

into the rest of the world. Heidegger's *fourfold* refers to the unity of the mortals (humans as beings), the sky, the earth, and the divinities. Heidegger (1954/1993) argues, as Ingold does, that when one part of our environment is authentically considered we necessarily account for the other three aspects. The four basic parts of our environment, necessarily interrelated, become one…the fourfold. In dwelling, we raise locales through *technē,* or skilled creative activity (Heidegger, 1954/1993).[24]

One *is* authentic when one accounts and cares for the fourfold in his or her skill, in what he or she produces and builds (Heidegger, 1954/1993). This is Heidegger's notion of *sparing,* and it has ethical implications for sense of place. Sparing in the simplest way involves letting things be as they are. Sparing may also take the form of active intervention, working for and maintaining a thing's sphere of nurture, that field of relations supporting its existence. "*The fundamental character of dwelling is this sparing"* which means more than not doing harm, as Heidegger (1954/1993) describes, "real sparing is something *positive*" (p. 351). From the relational model, based on Indigenous perspectives, land is the foundational constituent in any field of relations and sphere of nurture. "It is essential," explains Ingold (2000), "to 'look after' or care for the land, to maintain in good order the relationships it embodies; only then can the land, reciprocally, continue to grow and nurture those who dwell therein" (p. 149).

---

[24] In *Building Dwelling Thinking* Heidegger uses the word *technē* as opposed to Ingold's (2000) *tekhnē*. Both are cited in relation to technique, craft and skill. I will use *tekhnē* throughout unless specifically citing a usage by Heidegger. Heidegger (1993/1951) delves past this common understanding and uses the term to mean "to make something appear, within what is present, as this or that, in this way or that way" or "letting appear" (p. 361). This aspect of *tekhnē* is taken up in Ingold's fifth component of skill, that artefacts emerge through mutual person-substance interaction. The important commonality that distinguishes both Heidegger's and Ingold's use of *tekhnē* from a more common understandings is the insistence on an imminent poetic or creative element accompanied by a rejection that *tekhnē* is a merely mechanistic and procedural performance.

Fishwick and Vining (1992) make reference to Heidegger (1971) in relation to wilderness recreation and phenomenology of place. They interpret *sparing*, however, simply as a negative "leaving alone," and not as a positive "caring for." This ignores Heidegger's primary focus on the *processes* that 'give Being' and not the *form* of beings. To focus on the process is to see that sparing is an active "engagement with" (Crotty, 1998, p. 100). Borrie (1995), in my opinion, recognising the need for engagement and active sparing, more accurately describes Heidegger's idea of care. Despite this strength, Borrie remains within the romantic ideal of wilderness as "really real" or pristine and does not apply Heidegger's hermeneutic circle of being. From Ingold's (2000) and Heidegger's (1954/1993) perspective, researchers might understand wilderness areas as places built out of a flow if activity. Mortals such as Borrie and I, therefore, must reflect not only on the wilderness experience as evidence of the reality of wilderness, but also on the way we build wilderness in relation other people and places. Put another way, Borrie recognises the importance of authentic dwelling, yet does not apply this to the building of wilderness. He doesn't ask the question: does wilderness, in all its relations, respect the fourfold? Walker and Chapman (2003) also refer to Heidegger's sparing, as conceived by Relph (1976), as a leaving alone of places to be as they are. Yet Walker and Chapman relate sparing to the behaviours park visitors would be willing to undertake to actively care for a place, and in this sense are more closely aligned with my own understanding of sparing. Not simply the avoidance of harm, an ethic of sparing involves nurturing things so that they can contribute to the larger process of life.

Working from Heidegger's (1954/1993) notion of places gathering the fourfold, Ingold's (2000) analysis of *The harvesters* compares a church with a particular tree.

"Like the tree, the church by its very presence constitutes a place, which owes its character to the unique way in which it draws in the surrounding landscape" (p. 205-206). Moreover, the degree to which human components prevail in an environment makes a place seem more "built"; to the degree that non-human components prevail, the place will seem less so (Ingold, 2000). The extent to which non-built elements influence the individual's identity and sense of place depends on the prominence and attention these elements require within his or her tasks. All places are, however, "natural" in that dwelling precedes them; "what is or is not a building is a relative matter; moreover as human involvement may vary in the life history of a feature, it may be *more or less* of a building in different periods" (Ingold, 2000, p. 206). Inauthentic dwelling and places, then, come from a lack of attention, care, and empathy for the fourfold and not from being urban, rural, or wilderness. In attending to the fourfold in things, dwelling is a very real and active building—building-as-action that continually shapes a building-as-thing. Through skilled activity, ORE builds and maintains the meanings of particular things and places, such as canoes and the North. These activities include canoe tripping, park management, and environmental activism among others. These meaningful places and objects are not simply there, their existence and particular meaning is supported by human activity and relationships. The dwelling perspective allows practitioners and researchers to see that while these myths and places are part of the life-world we are born into, each of us can play a role in (re)creating, critiquing, and possibly changing them based on our skills and actions. To reach an authentic way of being, according to Heidegger (1954/1993), those of us who build places should do so sparingly, with care, and in a way that attends to the fourfold.

What of entering into a new landscape and making it into a place that feels like home? As Wearing and Neil (2000) show, an alien context forces the learning and adaptation of skill and alters one's sense of self and identity. Encountering an unfamiliar context or situation provides an opportunity for the individual to puzzle solve, intuit and imagine different ways of relating and being (Ingold, 2000; Wearing & Neil 2000). In this way, meaningful objects as well as persons exert some influence on each other (Ingold, 2000). The building and sensing of a place, then, is influenced by the extent to which individuals are able to mobilize the elements within their environment, gather and work within flows, and/or adapt their skills to weave themselves into a new context by coupling imagination with skill (Ingold, 2000). Moreover, this process is influenced by an individual's past experience along with the stories that guide, spark, haunt, limit, and otherwise influence that person's perception, imagination, receptivity, and understanding of possible ways to create home. Force, intimidation, and coercion are all skills that could be used in building places, yet they do not gather the fourfold and establish a sphere of nurture sparingly and with care. To create a sense of home, humans develop, practice, and implement skills that allow them to intimately know and be known in a place (Ingold, 2000). Through practices such as leave no trace (LNT), ORE leaders build, reaffirm, and shape a perception wilderness.

If I consider how LNT impacts the landscape, I see that beyond reducing expressions of student identity within the local landscape, LNT practices are largely reliant on resources such as oil and metal from other locales to build and maintain a particular style of wilderness area. I do not want to argue totally against LNT or minimum impact camping, for in many ways these practices fosters a sense of care for

the fourfold. Yet LNT can easily focus on removing evidence of human presence and not on careful attention to one's environment.

The form of a place such as a church or a tree, Ingold (2000) argues, "is an embodiment of a developmental or historical process, and is rooted in the context of human dwelling in the world" (p. 206). In the same way, wilderness is built and maintained through the use of politics, protest signs, tents, canoes, stoves, mound fires, poems, and stories. Though different than other places, human practices play a key role in building and maintaining wilderness. Wilderness itself is not a place, but rather a network of places, supposedly set aside from the "built" or "civilised" environment, that share some particular characteristics and history. Practitioners may help students relate backcountry experiences to a wider field of relations beyond the immediate landscape by acknowledging the practices that build wilderness. Put another way, students might trace the web of connections within their larger life-world—such as the production of nylon tents, dehydrated food, and particular cultural myths—that supports their local existence and experience in an ORE program. Tracing webs may serve to place wilderness in the context of current society. As the product of skilled building, wilderness areas and the "wilderness experience" do, in fact, embody Western identity. This position continually nags us with the question "in how we build, are we ethical?"

From the dwelling perspective, wilderness is a place that exists—for *some* individuals and communities—in their imagination and on the ground. Wilderness is a place built and sustained through the behaviours and actions of individuals in relation to the components of their environment (including individuals and communities for which wilderness does not exist, and still others for whom it exists as an anathema to their very

being). The idea that wilderness is a built environment is relatively new within ORE and certainly differs from the (anti)modern perspective. Ingold (2000) helps Western researchers and practitioners to see that wilderness is not only socially constructed, but is in fact socio-environmentally or ecologically built. From the dwelling perspective, those who build wilderness must be asked whether it is built in an authentic way—that is, do those who build wilderness ensure that mortals, the land, sky and divinities remain embodied within it as one?

MacLaren's (1999) article about the long-term changes in Jasper National Park describes the greening of hillsides (through fire protection) and the forced removal of people from their land among the socio-environmental changes used to build that place in line with the ideal wilderness of Anglo-North Americans. As I demonstrated in the critique of wilderness, it has been built as a place that either expressly excludes some humans or casts them in a light which is not their own, as the "noble savage" for example, or through cultural appropriation (Oles, 1995). Furthermore, wilderness has been a place built for recreation use and the tourism industry as well as the environmental movement and scientific community. Put differently, wilderness has the effect of not allowing all peoples to dwell authentically; it privileges certain people and has the potential to undermine others' ontological positions. Wilderness implies an inherently colonial understanding of landscape and, the most part, ORE activities occur within a dominant Western perspective. Given this, practitioners and researchers who invoke wilderness have a particular obligation to critically assess their own dominant ontological position relative to the others.

The idea of place building may help ORE professionals encourage transfer of learning from one locale to the next, between program locations or to the participant's every-day home environment. The idea of flows may help practitioners and participants to draw connections between their home and the location of the ORE program. Students might "tap into" flows that connect the two places or use skills derived in one flow for a similar flow at home such as predicting weather, sensing wind direction, watching the stars, or following the tides. Practitioners and participants might assess places for the ways and degrees to which the fourfold is spared and drawn forth. Do the mortals care for one another along with the land, sky, and spiritual well being? Is the land and sky able to nourish the mortals, and in what way? Do exchanges of substance and experience occur? Does the place allow for mortals to practice skill and foster the "bringing forth" or disclosing aspect of *tekhnē* that not only builds place but also reaffirms and develops identity?

Place researchers in ORE are accustomed to understanding how humans are attached to places. However, understanding our role in place building and the temporality of landscape, we might reverse this equation and see what aspects of a place are attached to, or dependant on, human activity. Such an approach might provide a way to understand the efforts and influence of individuals and groups on a particular locale. Being aware of the inevitability of place building, ORE participants, practitioners, and researchers can be tactful. We can work in the past, struggling to identify, critically examine, and carefully choose how and which personal and social stories influence and guide us. We can work in the present, intentionally adding ourselves to the place by (re)writing stories, (re)populating the wilderness, learning new skills with which to attend to the fourfold.

We can work in the future, examining the trail we lay down, and striving to do so with care and attention. Most persons involved with ORE have the best of intentions regarding wilderness and environmental protection, and the dwelling perspective on place allows us to be more careful, to further guide our actions and followers to see that in ORE we do not leave culture behind, but actually build a culture related to these places. By recognising the possibility of humans creatively and attentively building places and identity in relation to the rhythms of both the human and non-human world, the dwelling perspective may allow Western ORE practitioners and researcher to work towards Hull's (2000) suggestion that we attend to our relationship with nature not from a sombre (anti)modern perspective, but as a creative dance and celebration.

Chapter Four: Conclusion

My overarching critique is that ORE practices based loosely around deep ecology and the land ethic tend to be (anti)modern. While these practices refigure the values associated with nature and culture as a way to promote environmental responsibility, the practices and theory tends to uphold the dominant Western nature-culture dichotomy and come across as romantic and nostalgic. My intention in this thesis was to explore some possible benefits to ORE of an alternative ontological position in terms of creating socio-environmental responsibility in a more proactive manner.

I tried to show how assumptions regarding the categories of society, nature, and the individual have been perpetuated, somewhat uncritically, within Ford's (1981, 1986) definitions of outdoor education and outdoor recreation as well as within major structural divisions between adventure education (AE) and environmental education (EE). AE and EE are distinguished based on deeply rooted assumptions regarding the nature culture dichotomy: AE teaches mostly interpersonal and "social skills," while EE teaches predominantly scientific concepts and skills related to objective understanding of "nature." Not all cultures understand or draw the same distinctions between "society" and "nature." This disjuncture can result in difficulties for practitioners and researchers wishing to work cross-culturally or within a multi-cultural setting. Altering the division between these sub-sets of ORE, I have argued, is more than a task of mixing program elements. The task requires a different ontological position that can entertain the interplay of human and non-human processes and can help researchers and practitioners reshape their practices and language based on this meshing.

Among various critiques regarding the ability of ORE to foster socially and environmentally responsible participants, I was particularly concerned with Raffan's (1991) contention that ORE practitioners and researchers have failed to teach and understand forms of knowledge that connect people with places. My critique centred on the role of the nature-culture dichotomy in perpetuating this shortcoming. I argued that an ecological alternative to the (anti)modern explanation of person-place connections required refiguring three key themes within ORE: identity, landscape, and sense of place.

The influences of Western psychological and social-psychological approaches within ORE practice and research have meant that identity remains understood as a personal and social attribute uninfluenced by one's non-human environment. A critique of dominant understandings of identity, in light of a relational approach, will help ORE to: (a) overcome a disjuncture between practices and the stated values of the field, (b) find an alternative to the universal application of the nature-culture dichotomy, and (c) open new opportunities for connecting people with place. According to Beringer (2004) and Kivel (2000), dominant ORE research and practice tends to naturalize difference by assuming that identity is a stable set of characteristics belonging to, and within, an isolated human self. Kivel calls attention to identity-forming social processes. I argued that the nature-culture dichotomy is presented in both of these approaches. The first position sets identity as stable and set apart from a world "out there," while the second, in addressing the first, perpetuates the notion that identity and human forces of socialization exist separately from ecological and environmental processes.

Deep ecological ORE proposes an innate spiritual basis for ecocentric self-realisation that supposedly leads to identification with and action on behalf of one's

environment. The notion of an ecocentric identity forwarded by deep ecology within ORE tends to shun culture, requiring that it be "left behind" in order to access a deeply buried spiritual connection with all things. Exemplified in the myths surrounding Tom Thomson, transcendental and ecocentric ideals were shown to perpetuate androcentric notions of nature and identity in relation to wilderness and recreation. This androcentric approach has misrepresented the environmental relationships of many segments of Canadian society. Universal notions of an ecocentric identity gloss over the peculiarities of self and the importance of difference by promoting the notion that, in nature, "everything is one." Moreover, by assuming all humans can shed their culture, this approach to ORE leaves the distinction between culture and nature unchallenged. Furthermore, a narrowly conceived notion of ecocentric identity as an innate biological or spiritual reality appears no better able to account for cultural diversity or the difficulties wrought by wilderness preservation in separating rural and Indigenous people from their home or labelling them as primitive. I argued that this runs counter to Fox and Lautt's (1996) description of the core values of ORE. The debate over anthropocentric versus ecocentric notions of identity only serves to perpetuate a dichotomous separation of people and places while telling the ORE practitioner and researcher little about the importance or mechanisms of human attachment to place. Thus, ORE is left either with the dominant notion of identity as internal and relatively stable, or as a universal ecocentric positioning in which the particulars and agency of the person seem confounded by the sheer size of "the environment."

The adulation of wilderness frames the culture as an imposition on landscape. The dominant perspective within Western ORE conceives of wilderness as a benchmark of

environmental health. Landscape, in this view, begins as *terra nullius* and is covered over by layers of cultural meaning derived within human minds. This frames the evolution of human culture as a "race to the bottom" that has been won by a seething Western society out of touch with the environment, yet at the same time the most "sophisticated" and "advanced" of human cultures in its ability to transcend nature. Such a conceptualisation, according to Ingold (2000), is inherently colonial and encourages notions of primitivism. Unfortunately, *terra nullius* has been used as an excuse to sever long-standing relationships between people and their environment so as to "preserve" wilderness. Through practices such as LNT camping, the tradition of separating humans from landscape can also be seen the denial of Western cultural influence on wilderness landscapes.

As sublime, wilderness seems to be conceived as waiting to put humans in their "natural" place. The idea that culture and technology not only corrupt one's ability to understand nature but also serve to appropriate wilderness for the benefit of society leads deep ecological ORE to search for "direct experiences of nature" through "simple" practices. The idea that either nature conceals latent knowledge or culture produces ephemeral meaning may have lead ORE researchers and practitioners to overlook the role of skill in mediating and revealing meaning as relational. Thapa and Graefe (2003) show that pro-environmental values and behaviours associated with ORE do not come about simply by being in the out-of-doors, but are derived and exist within complex relationships that involve personal history, chosen activity, and the tools and technology employed.

Mirroring the approaches to identity discussed earlier, sense of place literature within ORE has generally fallen on either side of the nature-culture dichotomy. Place meaning is commonly attributed either to the form of the site or its social construction. Borrie and Roggenbuck's (1996) "authentic wilderness experience" describes the dominant Anglo-North American understating of wilderness as a place that transcends Western culture, and renders one humble in an experience of oneness that is facilitated by and fosters notions of primitiveness, timelessness, solitude, and care. Largely framed as escape from city life, experiences of wilderness have been associated with the social good, supposedly providing a deep-rooted human need and allowing for ethical extensions beyond the human realm. While ORE researchers and practitioners pay significant attention to the shape of the landscape, as wilderness or city, little work addressing the process of place making has been done.

I have argued that wilderness and ORE in Canada have strong nationalistic tendencies. The myths of the canoe and the North provide a wilderness idyll that supposedly speaks to a common "Canadian" experience of the land. Upon inspection, these myths can be seen as belonging to the dominant Anglo-North American tradition of terra nullius. Largely unattended to within ORE wilderness literature, these myths were and continue to be generated using overt nationalism, recreation, and tourism within a particular place, socio-economic class, and suit of activities to shape and build a sense of place. Yet within "Canadian" ORE the stories and myths have been naturalized, and therefore practitioners and researchers have paid little attention to the powerful process of wilderness place making that they themselves undertake.

In response to (anti)modernism, I examined Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective. Ingold's (2000) theory fleshes out an alternative ontological position in which humans are necessarily embedded and engaged with their environment. Surrounding and supporting Western society's assumed nature-culture dichotomy, Ingold argues, is a rhizomatic entanglement of environmental relations that enfold human sociality into larger ecological processes. "Society," then, is grown out of socio-environmental interactions that are tended to through skilled practice that shape landscape, speak identity, and form places. Thus, skill plays a crucial mediating role between an organism-person and his or her environment. The result of this mediation is a (re)formation of identity and landscape within a poetic of dwelling.

As a response to the dominant approaches, Ingold (2000) proposes a relational notion of identity that accounts for an influential non-human environment. Identity, according to Ingold, is grown reflexively and dynamically within a field of relations through skilled interaction with other organism-persons and various elements of their shared environment. An organism-person's skills communicate and stabilize his or her identity by leaving a personal trail that not only communicates to others but also shapes the landscape. Therefore, organism-persons come to identify, positively or negatively, with particular aspects of their environment that influence their well being. For ORE, the dwelling perspective allows practitioners and researchers to understand identity not as ecocentric but as ecological. Organism-persons do not identify *as* an element of the environment, but *in relation to* specific places, people, events, and activities that simultaneously connect a person to and differentiate them from others organism persons and aspects of their shared environment. Identity, then, can be established and understood

as a historic process somewhat similar to socialization yet responsive not only to other humans but also environmental factors that influence skill development and perception through formative experiences.

There are two important differences between my understanding of ecological self-realisation and that of the deep ecological perspective in ORE. First and most importantly, the dwelling perspective does not rely upon a buried connection, but rather on actively built relationships. Second, the ecological self is not a universal self, but rather the nexus in a specific field of relations that support the existence of the organism-person. Fields of relation can vary in scope and depth depending on the activity within a person's life. As Ingold (2000) notes about the concept of environment, it is always relative to the being whose environment it is; therefore "*my* environment is the world as it exists and takes on meaning in relation to me, and in that sense it came into existence and undergoes development with me and around me" (p. 20). Therefore, ORE professionals can assess the needs of students and help to teach skills within tasks designed to engage the student in a particular field of relations that suits the need of the student and objectives of the program.

Through dialogue and conversation, ORE researchers should be able to identify skills and formative experiences that are indexical of an organism-person's identity and salient in their field of relations. ORE practitioners and researchers interested in establishing or understanding connections between identity and place should inquire about elements of a participant's environment involved in experiences that change an organism-person's self-concept and comprehension of their life-world. To reinforce the environmentally embedded nature of humanity and a person's responsibility to place

building, practitioners and researchers can reframe human "impact" on landscape as a personal mark or trail that is indicative of a person's identity. Using locally relevant stories and learning to read the temporality of landscape may help students develop a more profound sense of place by helping them place their own experience within a larger socio-environmental history. Skills and activities, such as writing about personal experiences and local places, can be taught within ORE as a way to engage participants in an attentive relationship with their surroundings that allows them to speak their senses of place and identities to a wider community.

Neither a birth rite nor a universal realm, group identity could be gained through shared experiences and stories in a common environment that have led various organism-persons to apprehend their world from a similar perspective. Symbols and markers of identity, likewise, issue from particular experiences and activities. Group names, rituals, inside jokes, or common artefacts adopted or developed by a group indicate an emerging group identity established through shared experience and anchored in place. Such symbols tell of a group's or individual's field of relations, sense of place, and perception of the environment. Instead of identifying with place by shedding culture, certain ORE experiences coupled with skills such as storytelling, photography, or song writing have the potential to allow an organism-person to shape his or her personal and group identity by building and contributing to the meaning of places.

Working within the dwelling perspective means conceiving of landscape as enfolding a history of various human and non-human and movement and actions. Given the temporality of landscape, ORE practices not only occur on, but also actively build places and shape the landscape from within the environment. Researchers and

practitioners can use the dwelling perspective to understand places as centres of convergence of multiple organism-persons' life histories where exchanges of substance and experience have occurred and become embodied in the landscape. I used Canadian examples of land management, marketing, and recreation practices to describe the building of the wilderness ideal. I have tried to show how "nature" has been ecologically constructed in ways that are not necessarily socially or ecologically appropriate and seemingly problematic for a burgeoning multi-cultural society. This on-going process of building is sustained through skilled practices such as wildlife management and LNT camping. If, as Ingold (2000) suggests, meaning inheres in the forms of places and objects produced through skill, then we can see that wilderness and nature, according to dominant Western perspective within the outdoor recreation and tourism industry, has been built as a great place for humans to visit but not to live or create a home.

Based on the dwelling perspective, should practitioners or researchers decide to forgo the (anti)modern "shedding" culture approach to wilderness recreation, it appears likely that working with participants towards building places into a sense of home would benefit the project of connecting people with places. Helping students to build and maintain a sense of home in the backcountry, ORE would strive to facilitate skill development that allows participants to "stay in touch" with places and landscapes that they know intimately and in which they are known. Such a strong connection to place, Ingold (2000) argues, comes about through developing a sphere of nurture, depending on the land for sustenance, and sharing intimate and formative experiences with others.

This type of experience involves discovering new meaning within a landscape and, therefore marks change or growth in a participant's relationship with his or her

environment. Such insight, generating positive and/or negative feelings, can establish or add to a sense of place that helps a person become familiar with aspects of an environment. To understand a participant's attention to his or her environment and sense of place, along with changes in a sphere of nurture, researchers should watch for the place-origin of stories, topics of discussion, or communicated identity attributes used by the participant in an effort to know and become known in an environment. These indicators speak to the web of relations that supports the participant's sense of self in relation to others and the landscape. Practitioners and researchers can gain insight into place meanings, personal and social identities, as well as the extent of person-place interrelation by looking at the skills people use to understand, work within, gain a livelihood from, and shape a particular landscape.

The context-dependant and independent nature of skilled and technological knowledge, respectively, can greatly influence a participant's ability and opportunity to develop and maintain a sense of home within a particular environment. Skilled practice, from the dwelling perspective, is not a mere performance of the body directed by the mind. Rather, technique requires careful attention to a complex system involving the organism-person in an intuitive "gestural synergy" within his or her environment, learnt over time in association with the materials and other persons' performance. I have argued that skilled knowledge, because it is contextual, is essential in helping ORE practitioners and researchers understand and create connections between people and places. Traditional practice and tool use necessitates that the participant's attention be drawn into the landscape. Tools are brought into use and serve to draw the participant's attention further into his or her environment. Skill results in embodied knowledge that necessarily

depends on, and reflects, the environment in which one learns the skill. This knowledge is, according to Ingold (2000), incorporated into the very physiology and thought patterns of the organism-person. In much the same way, a place comes to reflect the tasks, skills, and flows that converge at a particular locale. Accessing this embodied knowledge within the landscape requires an organism-person to develop skill and learn from others how to attend to particular aspects of their environment. Skilfully engaging landscape provides an opportunity for identity formation and place building. Embodied skill provides the individual with an ability to weave his self and his world. This results in exchanges of substance and shared experience and ultimately develops into a sphere of nurture. The deeper and more integrated the sphere of nurture is with the local environment the more the person will find an attachment to place and derive a sense of self and identity from that place.

Technological knowledge, on the other hand, is context-independent and diminishes the need for the participant to attend to particular aspects of his or her environment to accomplish a task at hand. Technology does not imply mastery over nature or the triumph of civilization, as the modern perspective would imply, but rather the abstraction of skill and objectification of the person in task achievement. Technological devices provide entry into unfamiliar territory and opportunity to practice different skills within ORE, but they also diminish the necessity of a poetic relationship to one's surroundings. The outcome of using technology neither expresses nor establishes personality in relation to the landscape but rather relative to the device. Using examples of navigation and weather forecasting, I have shown how ORE practitioners, aware of the potential effect of tools and technology on environmental perception, can arrange

teaching sequences and assess the suitability of particular tools, to allow students to progress into the complexity and attentiveness required by certain skills. Furthermore, placing technological devices in abnormal contexts and using them for unusual tasks can expose their influence on environmental perception. Such a practice can also demonstrate how important task, knowledge type, imagination, and creativity are to perception. A GPS unit, for example, could be used as a tool for teaching the effects of technology on environmental perception.

I have argued that ORE involves the use of *technics* or human-made tools. Different from Ingold's (2000) examples of the Inuit and the Aboriginal peoples of the Australian Western Desert, most of the tools used by participants in ORE are not produced and or altered by them. Thus, we have a situation in which changes in tool design can "outstrip" and to some extent compensate for a skill development. This state of affairs means that ORE practitioners should be careful to match equipment to skill level and landscape in order to allow students to develop embodied knowledge over time suitable for the potential variety of conditions and tasks they may face.

From the dwelling perspective, sense of place is not wholly attributable to the site or to socially constructed meaning. The dwelling perspective, I argue, allows ORE researchers to explore person-place relationships as an ongoing socio-environmentally situated dialogue that must contend with the history of the place as well as other organism-persons. Places, linked by paths of movement, are particularly meaningful centres of convergence established through organism-persons' shared experiences and exchanges of substance. Within ORE, researchers will need to account for the life history, tasks at hand, and skills a participant does or does not have that allow him or her to

interpret place. Moreover, changes in place-perception could be assessed over time or between more and less skilled individuals.

The particular character of a place, according to Ingold (2000), is shaped by the daily activities and tasks developed and practiced in response to a locale. These activities allow humans to build a sense of home and share it with others. By embodying knowledge, skills and tool-use shape the way organism-persons hear, feel, see, taste and smell their environment as well as shape the landscape. The shape of landscape influences others' sense of place, skills, tasks, and perception and place-building efforts. Therefore, as ORE researchers, we should acknowledge sense of place is not entirely intrapersonal but is responsive to, evolves with, and exists in interpersonal relationships and environmental interactions. Experience, skill, activity, tools, and personal history all play a role in shaping one's sense of place. ORE researchers and practitioners can look to the fields of relations an organism-person brings to bear within a particular context in order to better understand his or her sense of place. The canoe, as a tool, offers a particular perspective on one's surroundings that can reveal meaning within the landscape. Examine the processes and activities through which places are built, ORE practitioners and researchers help may help some students to foster an awareness of their responsibility and agency in their life-world. By allowing participants to engage in a different current of activity, ORE experiences can allow persons to reflect on and imagine different ways to lead life. This is not, however, shedding culture or socialization, but creating a space for imagination regarding one's role and influence on "culture" to flourish within a different setting that can be brought into connection with one's every-day life-world and communicated to other persons in other places.

The notion that flows and paths connect places allows ORE practitioners to trace and establish a larger context that includes both the wilderness and the city thereby possibly increasing transfer of learning between urban and backcountry landscapes. Having researchers, practitioners, and participants discuss the meanings, perspectives, and salience of different modes of transportation relative to formative experiences could lead to better understanding of where, why, and how participants and programmers draw boundaries around places or networks of places. Where do participants and practitioners frame the start and end of an ORE experience? Where do participants draw boundaries around places? How do they connect places? Which flows can they draw upon that are common to different environments? How can practitioners and educators capitalize on these to promote transfer of learning?

Meaningful aspects of place are revealed through an education of attention by way of formative experience and mentorship. Such an education allows an organism-person to draw certain elements from within his or her environment to bear on a particular task thereby shaping the world and producing goods that support his or her existence. Stories and markers of identity, like the canoe and the North, result from past experiences and influence future perception and action within one's environment. Stories can be used as a way to understand and shape sense of place. Organism-persons, being self aware and imaginative, have the ability to critically reflect on the activities, stories, and myths they generate and propagate. Moreover, through formative experiences and the practice of skill, organism-persons change their abilities to perceive their surroundings, (re)write myths, and weave themselves into and out of the landscape in new and different ways. To better understand an organism-person's sense of place and locate it within a

larger context, ORE practitioners, researchers, and/or students could trace a network of places, flows, and activities involving the skills, tools, and activities of others that support and shape his or her experience.

As ORE practitioners, if we want participants to connect and identify with place we will need to provide our students and followers with ways of building and influencing places. Students will need to be able to understand a locale as a place that has a specific history and pattern of movement. Participants will also need to attend to their actions that influence the nature of a place so that they might weave themselves into a locale, come to understand aspects of it, and communicate place meaning to others.

Conscious attention to the process of place making through daily activities, critical and creative story telling, skilled interaction with landscape, and attentive perception provide an avenue for ORE researchers and practitioner to encourage students' environmental responsibility and activism within their home environments. The rhizome-like structure of one's life world and identity, responsive to and entangled with other organism-person's and non-human processes, requires a rethinking of ethical parameters that could be guided by Heidegger's (1954/1993) *fourfold*, the necessary interrelated nature of mortals, the earth, sky, and divinities. Both Heidegger and Ingold (2000) suggest that the essence of dwelling is an active engagement in *sparing* those things that provide a sphere of nurture.

ORE, from the dwelling perspective, takes on a more socio-environmentally relevant and active milieu by becoming an arena for crafting meaningful relationships with human and non-human objects, Others, and processes thereby redefining one's sphere of nurture, home environment, and poetic of dwelling. Awareness and meaning,

from the dwelling perspective, would arise from practitioners and participants actively living and learning to engage and attend to the growth of their environment while creating a sense of home through skills that allow them to weave both identity and place.

Future Research

I have investigated some of the applications and consequences of the dwelling perspective as an ecological approach to creating person-place connections within ORE on a theoretical level. Coupling Ingold's notions of skill and dwelling, I have attempted to open up implications for place creation, positioning, movement, and perception of one's environment. However, a more comprehensive heuristic framework will also need to include Ingold's theory and research on livelihood. I would suggest detailed application of specific chapters or concepts, coupled with empirical research techniques to help fill out and establish a heuristic framework over time. "Ground-truthing" research in lived ORE practice is now needed to explore the relevance, effect, and manifestation of a temporal landscape, relational identity, and network of places as vortices in a world of movement. Do students and instructors relate to these ideas and ways of being? Can they negotiate adopting them? How does this play out in lived practice? What aspects of programs are conducive to the dwelling perspective, and which reinforce the dominant Western perspective?

Investigation seems warranted into the influences of skill, tools, and technology on participant's environmental perception and connection with places and flows. How do different artefacts, tools, and technological devices influence the field of relations within a shared group experience? What objects become focal in communal activity? How do they influence perception of the environment? How can participants, researchers, and

practitioners learn and teach about place connection from these objects and patterns of activity?

Exploring and mapping fields of relation with a participant can provide an important way of evaluating and understanding that person's place connections relevant to their life-world. Understanding the ways in which participants and practitioners create and foster a sense of home, resonant with cycles in their environment, would make a significant contribution to comprehending ORE experiences from the perspective of dwelling. Where, when, and why do participants feel "in place" or "out of place"? How do they deal with this? Research tools such as short daily open-ended questions or prompts for journaling or closed-ended scales to measure environmental attitudes may prove helpful in assessing change throughout an extended trip.

By understanding socio-environmentally responsible behaviour as careful and sparing place-making efforts, ORE researchers and practitioners should be able to compare and foster connections between city life and backcountry ORE experiences. Comparing ways to frame ORE practices such as LNT and artistic skills such as painting and writing relative to the temporality of landscape will be important for shifting the way participants and practitioners apprehend their environment. Various forms of navigation and wayfinding can be compared or used within ORE experiences to alter participant's sense of place. The dwelling perspective shows that working with students to identify and understand flows is an important component of developing a sense of place and connecting various places within a larger context. How do such approaches influence the student's experience?

Critique of dominant stories and myths can be used to help students understand how wilderness places are built. Researchers should, then, consider whether such an altered notion of wilderness changes a participant's sense of responsibility and care for the landscape. Researchers might investigate the effects of hearing, reading, writing, and following stories as ways of framing and shaping a participant's ORE experience. A hermeneutic approach to self-reflexive narrative might be used to understand a participant's interaction with and perception of place given Ingold's (2000) understanding of speech, writing, and story. Such an approach will depend on the participant's experience and skill in self-reflection and writing. Moreover, collaborative and creative research approaches, such as action research that uses commonplace journaling techniques in response to lived experience, may be able to account for dialogical aspects of meaning creation, formative experiences, and connections to place.

References

Altmetyer, G. (1995). Three ideas of nature in Canada, 1893-1914. In C. Gaffield, & P. Gaffield (Eds.), *Consuming Canada: Readings in environmental history* (pp. 96-118). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Copp Clark.

Anderson, B. (2001). Staging antimodernism in the age of high capitalist nationalism. In L. Jessup (Ed.), *Antimodernism and the artistic experience: Policing the boundaries of modernity* (pp. 97-103). Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Anderson, C. (2000). *Identity and ecology in Arctic Siberia.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, J. (1999). A word for adventure education. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure Programming* (pp. 39-42). State College PA: Venture.

Barber, K. (Ed.). (2001). *The Canadian Oxford Dictionary*. Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Basso, K.H. (1996). Wisdom sits in places: notes on a Western Apache landscape. In S. Feld, & K.H. Basso (Eds.), *Senses of place* (pp.53-90). Santa Fe, NM: School or American Research Press.

Baumeister, R.F. (1991). *Meanings of life.* New York: Guilford Press.

Bennion, J. & Olsen, B. (2002). Wilderness writing: Using personal narrative to enhance outdoor experience. *The Journal of Experiential Education,* 25(1), 239-246.

Beringer, A. (1990). Understanding moral development and environmental values through experience. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 13(3), 29-34.

Beringer, A. (2004). Toward an ecological paradigm in adventure programming. *Journal of Experiential Education, 27*(1), 51-66.

Bordo, J. (1992-1993, Winter). Jack Pine-wilderness sublime or the erasure of the Aboriginal presence from the landscape. *Revue d'etudes canadiannes/Journal of Canadian Studies,* 27(4), 98-128.

Bordo, J. (1997, Spring). The Terra Nullius of wilderness—colonialist landscape art (Canada & Australia) and the so-called claim to American exception. *International Journal of Canadian Studies / Revue internationale d'etudes canadiennes*, 15, 13-36.

Borrie, W.T. (1995). Letting it be: Heidegger, leisure and wilderness. Retrieved September 4, 2004, from http://www.forestry.umt.edu/personnel/faculty/borrie/papers/heid/

Borrie, W.T., & Roggenbuck, J.W., (1996). Providing authentic wilderness experience? Thinking beyond the Wilderness Act of 1964. In L.H. McAvoy, L.A. Stringer, M.D. Bialeschki, & A.B. Young (Eds.), *Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Research Symposium Proceedings* (pp.7-8). Bradford Woods, IN: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Bricker, K.S., & Kerstetter, D.L. (2000). Level of specialization and place attachment: An exploratory study of whitewater recreationists. *Leisure Sciences,* 22, 233-257.

Brown, T., & Jones, L. (2001). Research and the development of practice. *Action Research and Postmodernism*. London: Open University Press.

Bunting, C.J., & Townley, J.T. (1999). A synthesis of environmental and adventure education concepts: a professional responsibility. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure Programming* (pp. 433-437). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Cameron, R. D. (1999). Tom Thomson, antimodernism, and the ideal of manhood. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association, Revue de la société historique du Canada,*185-208.

Capra, F. (1995). Deep ecology: A new paradigm. In G. Sessions (Ed.), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism* (pp. 19-25). Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Carpenter, E. (1973). *Eskimo realities.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Carson, T.R., & Sumara, D.J. (Eds.). (1997) *Action Research as a Living Practice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishers.

Collins, J., & Selina, H. (1999). *Introducing Heidegger*. Cambridge: Icon Books.

Colwell, Thomas (1997). The nature-culture distinction and the future of environmental education. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 28(4), 4-9

Cottrell, W.F. (1939). Of time and the railroader. *American Sociological Review,* 4, 118-135.

Cronon, W. (1996). The trouble with wilderness: Or, getting back to the wrong nature. *Environmental History*, 1(1), 7-28.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Csikezentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience.* New York: Harper.

Cuthbertson, B., Heine, M., & Whitson, D. (1996). Producing meaning through movement: An alternative view of sense of place. Presentation at The Learneds Societies, Montreal, Quebec.

Deleuze, G. & Guttari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Devall, B., & Sessions, G. (1985). *Deep ecology: Living as if nature mattered.* Salt Lake City, UT: Peregrine Smith Books.

Drengson, A. (1995). The Trumpeter remains aloft. *Trumpeter, 12(3)*, ISSN: 0832-6193. Retrieved October 28th, 2004, from http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/content/v12.3/drengson.html

Drengson, A. (2001). Education for local and global ecological responsibility: Arne Naess's Cross-cultural, ecophilosophy approach. *Trumpeter, 17(1)*. Retrieved December 3, 2003, from http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/content/v17.1/drengson.html

Dustin, D.L. (1990 September). Looking inward to save the outdoors. *Parks and Recreation,* 86-89.

Dustin, D.L., & McAvoy, L.H. (1987). Outdoor recreation and the environment: problems and prospects. *The Environmental Professional*, 9, 343-346.

Dustin, D.L., McAvoy, L.H., & Schultz, J.H. (1991). Recreation rightly understood. In T.L. Goodale, & P.A. Witt (Eds.), *Recreation and leisure: Issues in an era of change* (pp. 97-106). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Dustin, D.L., Schneider, I.E., McAvoy, L.H., & Frakt, A.N. (2002). Cross-cultural claims on Devils Tower National Monument: A case study. *Leisure Sciences*, 24, 79–88.

Ely, M., Vinz, R., Downing, M. & Anzul, M. (1997). *On writing qualitative research: Living by words.* Philadelphia, PA: RoutledgeFalmer.

Ewert, A., & Galloway, S. (2001). Adventure recreation: what's new for resource managers, public policy analysts, and recreation providers. *Parks & Recreation*, 36(2), 26,28,30-35.

Ewert, A. (1996). Research in outdoor education: Our place on the porch. In L.H. McAvoy, L.A. Stringer, M.D. Bialeschki, & A.B. Young (Eds.), *Coalition for education in the outdoors third research symposium proceedings* (pp. 7-8). Cortland, NY: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Fishwick, L., & Vining, J. (1992). Toward a phenomenology of recreation place. *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 12, 57-63.

Ford, P. (1981). *Principles and practices of outdoor/environmental education*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Ford, P. (1986). Outdoor education: Definition and philosophy. Report No. ED267941). Charleston WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service)

Fox, K. M. (2000). Navigating confluences: Revisiting the meaning of "wilderness experience." *Proceedings of the USDA Forest Service, USA, RMRS-P-15-VOL-2*,49-58.

Fox, K.M., & Lautt, M. (1996). SE ethical frameworks, moral practices and outdoor education. In L.H. McAvoy, L.A. Stringer, M.D. Bialeschki, & A.B. Young (Eds.), *Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Third Research Symposium Proceedings* (pp. 18-33). Bradford Woods, IN: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Ferry, L. (1995). *The new ecological order* (C. Volk, Trans.). IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1992)

Francis, D, (1997). *National dreams: Myth, memory, and Canadian history*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: Arsenal Pulp.

Freysinger, V.J., & Kelly, J.R. (2004). *21st century leisure: Current issues (2nd ed.)*. State College, PA: Venture.

Gillis, H.L. Jr., & Ringer, M.T. (1999). Adventure as therapy. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp.29-37). State College, PA: Venture.

Guha, R. (1998). Radical American environmentalism and wilderness preservation: A third world critique. In D. Van DeVeer, & C. Pierce (Eds.), *The environmental ethics and policy book* (2nd ed., pp. 515-522). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Wadsworth.

Greider, T., & Garkovich, L. (1994). Landscapes: The social construction of nature and the environment. *Rural Sociology*, 59(1), 1-24.

Haggard, L.M. & Williams, D.R. (1991). Self-identity benefits of leisure activities. In B.L. Driver, P.J. Brown, & G.L. Peterson, (Eds.), *Benefits of Leisure* (pp. 103-119). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Haluza-Delay, R. (1999) Navigating the terrain: Helping care for the earth. In J.C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.) *Adventure programming* (pp. 445-454). State College, PA: Venture.

Hanna, G. (1995). Wilderness-related environmental outcomes of adventure and ecology education programming. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 27(1), 21-32.

Harper, S. (1995). The way of wilderness. In T. Roszac, M.E. Gomes, & A.D. Kanner (Eds.), *Ecopsychology: Restoring the earth healing the mind* (pp. 183-200). San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.

Hay, P. (2002). *Main currents in Western environmental thought*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). New York: Harper Collins. (Original work published 1927)

Heidegger, M. (1971). *In poetry, language and thought.* New York: Harper and Row.

Heidegger, M. (1993). Building dwelling thinking. In D.F. Krell, (Ed.), & A. Hofstadter (Trans.), *Martin Heidegger basic writings: from Being and Time (1927) to The Task of Thinking (1964)* (Rev. ed.). New York: Harper Collins. (Original work published 1954)

Heidegger, M. (1993). The origin of the work or art. In D.F. Krell, (Ed. & Trans.), & A. Hofstadter (Trans.), *Martin Heidegger basic writings: from Being and Time (1927) to The Task of Thinking (1964)*(Rev. ed.). New York: Harper Collins. (Original work published 1960)

Heidegger, M. (1999). Contributions to philosophy: (From enowning). P. Emad, & K. Maly (Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Original work published 1989)

Henderson, K. (1990, March). Deep ecology and outdoor recreation—incompatible? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 78, 77-80.

Henderson, B. (1987). Looking beyond the activity of outdoor pursuits. *Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal,* 11, 9-13.

Henderson, B. (1994). How deep ecology and critical social theory come together in outdoor travel guiding: on the discovery of being a researcher. In L.H McAvoy, L.A. Stringer, & A. Ewert (Eds.), *Coalition for Education in the outdoors second research symposium proceedings* (pp. 90-91). Cortland, NY: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors.

Henderson, B. (1997). Friluftsliv. *Trumpeter, 14(2).* Retrieved November 15, 2003, from http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/content/v14.2/henderson2.html

Henderson, B. (1999) The place of deep ecology and ecopsychology in adventure education. In J.C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure Programming* (pp. 439-444). State College, PA: Venture.

Hirsch, J. (1999). Developmental adventure programs. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure Programming* (pp. 13-27). State College PA: Venture.

Horwood, B. (1991). Tasting the berries: Deep ecology and experiential education. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 14(3), 23-26.

Humberstone, B., & Pedersen, K. (2001). Gender, class and outdoor traditions in the UK and Norway. *Sport Education and Society*, 6(1), 23-33.

Hull, R.B. (2000). Moving beyond the romantic biases in natural areas recreation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1), 54-57.

Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. New York: Routledge.

Ingerson, A.E. (1994). Tracking and testing the nature-culture dichotomy. In L.C. Crumley (Ed.), *Historical ecology* (pp. 44-66). Sante Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Jasen, P. (1995). *Wild things: Nature, culture, and tourism in Ontario, 1790-1914*. Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Jessup, L. (2002). The group of seven and the tourist landscape in Western Canada, or the more things change.... *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 37(1), 144-179.

Jostad, P., McAvoy, L.H. & McDonald, D. (1996). Native American land ethics: Implications for natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 9, 565-581.

Kaltenborn, B.P. (1997). Nature of place attachment: A study among recreation homeowners in Southern Norway. *Leisure Science, 19, 175-189.*

Kelly, J.R. (1983). *Leisure identities and interactions.* London, England: George Allen and Unwin.

Kivel, B.D. (2000). Leisure experience and identity: What difference does difference make? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1), 70-81.

Klint, K.A. (1999). New directions for inquiry into self-concept and adventure experiences. In J.C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure Programming* (pp. 163-168). State College, PA: Venture.

Krell, D.F. (1993). Building dwelling thinking [Editors introduction]. In D.F. Krell, (Ed.) *Martin Heidegger basic writings: from Being and Time (1927) to The Task of Thinking (1964)*(Rev. ed., pp. 344-346). New York: Harper Collins.

Kuentzel, W.F. (2000). Self-identity, modernity, and the rational actor in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 32(1), 87-93.

Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern* (C. Porter, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published in 1992).

Leopold, A. (1948). A *Sand County almanac*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lo, Y.S. (2001). The land ethic and Callicott's ethical system (1980-2001): An overview and critique. *Inquiry, 44,* 331-58.

Loo, T. (2001). Making a modern wilderness: Conserving wildlife in twentieth-century Canada. *Canadian Historical Review,* 82(1), 92-121.

MacLaren, I.S. (1999). Cultured wilderness in Jasper National Park. *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes, 34*(3), 3-54.

Mannell, R.C., & Kleiber, D.A. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure.* State College: PA. Venture.

Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review,* 98(2), 224-253. Retrieved October 1, 2004, from http://gateway.ut.ovid.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/gw1/ovidweb.cgi

Martin, V.G. (2001). Soul of the wilderness: The World Wilderness Congress. *International Journal of Wilderness,* 7(1), 1-9. Retrieved January 15, 2005, from http://www.wilderness.net/library/documents/martin2.pdf

McAvoy, L.H. (1990, September.). An environmental ethic for parks and recreation. *Parks and Recreation,* 68-72.

McAvoy, L.H. (1999). Rescue-free wilderness areas. In J.C. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.) *Adventure programming* (pp. 325-329). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

McAvoy, L.H. (2002). American Indians, place meanings and the old/new west. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 34(4), 383-396.

McAvoy, L.H, & Dustin, D. (1989). Resurrecting the frontier. *Trends*, 26(3), 40-42.

McAvoy, L.H., McDonald, D., & Carlson, M. (2003). American Indian/First Nation place attachment to park lands: The case of the Nuu-chah-nulth of British Columbia. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration,* 1(2), 84-104.

McCombs, W.D. (1995, October). Therapeutic rusticity: Antimodernism, health and the wilderness vacation, 1870-1915. *New York History,* 409-428.

McDonald, B.L., & Schreyer, R. (1991). Spiritual benefits on leisure participation and leisure settings. In B.L. Driver, P.J. Brown, & G.L. Peterson, (Eds.), *Benefits of Leisure* (pp. 179-194). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Meyer, M.A. (1994). A cultural imperative for wilderness adventure programs: A native Hawaiian example. *Journal of Experiential Education,* 17(3), 11-15.

Meyers, F.R. (2001). Introduction to part one: Around and about modernity: Some comments on themes of primitivism and modernism. In Jessup, L. (Ed.), *Antimodernism and the artistic experience: Policing the boundaries of modernity* (pp. 13-25). Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Miles, J.C. (1999). Wilderness. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp. 321-323). State College, PA: Venture

Mills, A.S. (1985). Participation motivations for outdoor recreation: a test of Maslow's theory [Abstract]. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 17(3). 184-199.

Naess, A. (1995). Self-realisation: An ecological approach to being in the world. In G. Sessions, (Ed.), *Deep ecology for the 21st century: Readings on the philosophy and practice of the new environmentalism* (pp. 225-239). Boston: Shambhala.

Oles, G.W.A (1995). "Borrowing" activities from another culture: A Native American's perspective. In K. Warren, M. Sakofs, & J.S. Jr. Hunt, (Eds.), *The theory of experiential education* (pp. 195-200). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

Pile, S. & Thrift, N. (1995). *Mapping the subject: Geographies of cultural transformation.* Scarborough, Ontario, Canada: Routledge.

Plumwood, V. (1998). Nature, self, and gender: feminism, environmental philosophy, and the critique of rationalism. In D. Van DeVeer, & C. Pierce (Eds.), *The environmental ethics and policy book* (2nd ed., pp. 246-249). Toronto: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Pohl, S., Borrie, W., & Patterson, M. (2000). Women, wilderness and everyday life: A documentation of the connection between wilderness recreation and women's everyday lives. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(4), 415-434.

Potter, T. & Henderson, B. (2001). Outdoor adventure education in Canada: Seeking the country way back in. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 6, 255-242.

Priest, S. (1986). Redefining outdoor education. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 17(3), 13.

Priest, S. (1999). The semantics of adventure programming. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp. 111-114). State College, PA: Venture

Priest, S. & Gass, M. (1997). *Effective leadership in adventure programming*. University of New Hampshire, NH: Human Kinetics.

Quinn, M. & Scott, J. (1997). Of mega-malls and soft-shelled turtles: Deep ecological education to counter homogeneity. *Trumpeter, 14(2)*. Retrieved November 15, 2003, from http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/content/v14.2/quinn-scott.html

Raffan, J. (1991). *Frontier, Homeland, and Sacred Space: A Collaborative Investigation into Cross-cultural Perceptions of Place in the Thelon Game Sanctuary, Northwest Territories.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Queen's University, Ontario, Canada.

Rhemtulla, J.M, Hall, R.J., Higgs, E.S., & Macdonald, S.E. (2002). Eighty years of change: Vegetation in the montane ecoregion of Jasper National Park, Alberta, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research,* 32, 2010-2021.

Roberts, N. & Rodriguez, D.A. (1999). *Multicultural issues in outdoor education* (Report No. EDO-RC-99-6). Charleston WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED438151)

Russell, C.L. Bell, A.C. & Fawcett, L. (2000). Navigating the waters of Canadian environmental education. In T. Goldstein, & D. Selby (Eds.), *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice* (pp.196-217). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Sumach.

Ryan, S. (1999). *Environmental Ethics: An Interpretive Analysis.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Ryan, S. (2002). Cyborgs in the woods. *Leisure Studies,* 21, 265-284.

Sasidharan, V. (2002). Special issue introduction: Understanding recreation and the environment with the context of culture. *Leisure Sciences*, 24, 1-11.

Scott, C.E., Schoenbohm, S.M., Vallenga-Neu, D., & Vallenga, A. (2001). *Companion to Heidegger's Contributions to Philosophy.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Sessions, G. (1995a). Preface. In G. Sessions (Ed.), *Deep ecology for the 21st century: Readings on the philosophy and practice of the new environmentalism* (pp. ix-xxviii). Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Sessions, G. (1995b). Ecocentrism and the anthropocentric detour. In G. Sessions (Ed.), *Deep ecology for the 21st century: Readings on the philosophy and practice of the new environmentalism* (pp. 156-183). Boston: Shambhala.

Shogan, D. (1988). The paradox of physical activity in the wilderness. In. P.J. Galasso. (Ed.), *Philosophy of sport and physical activity: Issues and concepts* (pp. 210-215). Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Shogan, D. (2002). Characterising constraints of leisure: A Foucaultian analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Studies,* 21, 27-38.

St. Pierre, E.A. (1997). Circling the text: Nomadic writing practices. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 3(4), 403-417.

Stokowski, P.A. (2002). Languages of place and discourses of power: Constructing new senses of place. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 34(4), 368-382.

Sumara, D. (2002). Creating commonplaces for interpretation: Literary anthropology and literacy education research. *Journal of Literary Research,* 34(2), 237-259.

Thapa, B. & Graefe, A.R. (2003, Spring). Forest recreationists and environmentalism. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 21(1), 75-103.

Turner, J..M. (2002). From woodcraft to 'leave no trace': wilderness, consumerism, and environmentalism in twentieth-century America. *Environmental History,* 462-484.

Turner, J. (1996). *The abstract wild.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1991). Language and the making of place: A narrative-descriptive approach [Electronic version]. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 81*(4), 684-696.

Wadland, J. (1995). Wilderness and culture. In C. Gaffield, & P. Gaffield (Eds.), *Consuming Canada: Readings in environmental history* (pp. 12-15). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Copp Clark.

Walker, G.J. & Chapman, R. (2003). Thinking like a park: The effects of sense of place, perspective-taking, and empathy on pro-environmental intentions. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 21(4), 71-86.

Walker, G.J. & Deng, J. (2003/2004). Comparing leisure as a subjective experience with the Chinese experience of rùmí. *Leisure/Loisir,* 28(3-4), 245-276.

Walker, G.J., Deng, J. and Dieser, R.B. (2001). Ethnicity, acculturation, self-construal, and motivations for outdoor recreation. *Leisure Sciences,* 23, 263-283.

Walker, G.J., & Fox, K. (2000). Place, meaning, and river guides: A case study [Abstract]. In R. Burdge, J. Miles, D. Alper, & L. Kruger (Eds.), *Book of abstracts: 8th International Symposium on Society and Resource Management* (p. 328).

Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific North West Station.

Walker, G.J., Hull, R.B. IV, & Roggenbuck, J.W. (1998). On-site optimal experiences and their relationship to off-site benefits. *Journal of Leisure Research,* 30(4), 452-471.

Wall, A.E., Reid, G. & Harvey, W.J. (2004). Interface of the knowledge-based and ecological task analysis approaches (Tech. Rep.). Montreal, Canada: McGill University, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education.

Warren, K. (2002). Preparing the next generation: Social justice in outdoor leadership education and training. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 25(1), 231-238.

Wearing, S. & Archer, D. (2002). Challenging interpretation to discover more inclusive models: The case of adventure tour guiding. *World Leisure Journal*, 44(3), 43-53.

Wearing, S. & Neil, J. (2000). Refiguring self and identity through volunteer tourism. *Loisir et Societe/Society and Leisure,* 23(2), 389-419.

Webb, D.J. (1999). Recreational outdoor adventure programs. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure programming* (pp. 3-8). State College PA: Venture.

Williams, K. & Harvey, D. (2001). Transcendent experiences in forest environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 249-260.

Wilson, A. (1991). *The culture of nature: North American landscape from Disney to the Exxon Valdez.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Between The Lines.

Wurdinger, S., & Priest, S. (1999). Integrating theory and application in experiential learning. In J.C. Miles, & S. Priest, *Adventure programming* (pp. 187-192). State College, PA: Venture.